U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Technology Transfer Network Clearinghouse for Inventories & Emission Factors

AP-42, Fifth Edition, Volume I Chapter 3: Stationary Internal Combustion Sources

Explanation of File Formats

NOTE: Many AP-42 files contain equation fonts that may not be readable on some computers. If you encounter problems with viewing AP-42 documents contact the Info CHIEF Help Desk, (919) 541-1000.

3.1 Stationary Gas Turbines
- Final Section - Supplement F, April 2000 (PDF 84K)
- Background Document (PDF 246K)
- Related Info.

3.2 Natural Gas-fired Reciprocating Engines
- Final Section - Supplement F, August 2000 (PDF 52K)
- Background Document (PDF 160K)
- Related Info.

3.3 Gasoline and Diesel Industrial Engines
- Final Section - Supplement B, October 1996 (PDF 35K)
- Background Document (PDF 184K)

3.4 Large Stationary Diesel and All Stationary Dual-fuel Engines
- Final Section - Supplement B, October 1996 (PDF 41K)
- Background Document (PDF 254K)

AP-42 Emission Factors by Chapter

| Office of Air Quality Planning & Standards | Technology Transfer Network |
| Clearinghouse for Inventories & Emission Factors |

EPA Home | Privacy and Security Notice | Contact Us

Last updated on Friday, September 3rd, 2004
URL: http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ap42/ch03/

AP-42, Fifth Edition, Volume I
Chapter 3: Stationary Internal Combustion Sources

Explanation of File Formats

NOTE: Many AP-42 files contain equation fonts that may not be readable on some computers. If you encounter problems with viewing AP-42 documents contact the Info CHIEF Help Desk, (919) 541-1000.

3.1 Stationary Gas Turbines

- Final Section - Supplement F, April 2000 (PDF 84K)
- Background Document (PDF 246K)
- Related Info.

3.2 Natural Gas-fired Reciprocating Engines

- Final Section - Supplement F, August 2000 (PDF 52K)
- Background Document (PDF 160K)
- Related Info.

3.3 Gasoline and Diesel Industrial Engines

- Final Section - Supplement B, October 1996 (PDF 35K)
- Background Document (PDF 184K)

3.4 Large Stationary Diesel and All Stationary Dual-fuel Engines

- Final Section - Supplement B, October 1996 (PDF 41K)
- Background Document (PDF 254K)

AP-42 Emission Factors by Chapter

| Office of Air Quality Planning & Standards | Technology Transfer Network |
| Clearinghouse for Inventories & Emission Factors |

EPA Home | Privacy and Security Notice | Contact Us

Last updated on Friday, September 3rd, 2004
URL: http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ap42/ch03/

3.2 Natural Gas-fired Reciprocating Engines

3.2 FINAL SECTION

3.2.1 General[1-3]

Most natural gas-fired reciprocating engines are used in the natural gas industry at pipeline compressor and storage stations and at gas processing plants. These engines are used to provide mechanical shaft power for compressors and pumps. At pipeline compressor stations, engines are used to help move natural gas from station to station. At storage facilities, they are used to help inject the natural gas into high pressure natural gas storage fields. At processing plants, these engines are used to transmit fuel within a facility and for process compression needs (e.g., refrigeration cycles). The size of these engines ranges from 50 brake horsepower (bhp) to 11,000 bhp. In addition, some engines in service are 50 - 60 years old and consequently have significant differences in design compared to newer engines, resulting in differences in emissions and the ability to be retrofitted with new parts or controls.

At pipeline compressor stations, reciprocating engines are used to power reciprocating compressors that move compressed natural gas (500 - 2000 psig) in a pipeline. These stations are spaced approximately 50 to 100 miles apart along a pipeline that stretches from a gas supply area to the market area. The reciprocating compressors raise the discharge pressure of the gas in the pipeline to overcome the effect of frictional losses in the pipeline upstream of the station, in order to maintain the required suction pressure at the next station downstream or at various downstream delivery points. The volume of gas flowing and the amount of subsequent frictional losses in a pipeline are heavily dependent on the market conditions that vary with weather and industrial activity, causing wide pressure variations. The number of engines operating at a station, the speed of an individual engine, and the amount of individual engine horsepower (load) needed to compress the natural gas is dependent on the pressure of the compressed gas received by the station, the desired discharge pressure of the gas, and the amount of gas flowing in the pipeline. Reciprocating compressors have a wider operating bandwidth than centrifugal compressors, providing increased flexibility in varying flow conditions. Centrifugal compressors powered by natural gas turbines are also used in some stations and are discussed in another section of this document.

A compressor in storage service pumps gas from a low-pressure storage field (500 - 800 psig) to a higher pressure transmission pipeline (700 - 1000 psig) and/or pumps gas from a low-pressure transmission line (500 - 800 psig) to a higher pressure storage field (800 - 2000 psig).

Storage reciprocating compressors must be flexible enough to allow operation across a wide band of suction and discharge pressures and volume variations. The compressor must be able to compress at high compression ratios with low volumes and compress at low compression ratios with high volumes. These conditions require varying speeds and load (horsepower) conditions for the reciprocating engine powering the reciprocating compressor.

Reciprocating compressors are used at processing plants for process compression needs (e.g. refrigeration cycles). The volume of gas compressed varies, but the pressure needed for the process is more constant than the other two cases mentioned above.

3.2.2 Process Description[1-3]

Natural gas-fired reciprocating engines are separated into three design classes: 2-cycle (stroke) lean-burn, 4-stroke lean-burn, and 4-stroke rich-burn. Two-stroke engines complete the power cycle in a

single crankshaft revolution as compared to the two crankshaft revolutions required for 4-stroke engines. All engines in these categories are spark-ignited.

In a 2-stroke engine, the air-to-fuel charge is injected with the piston near the bottom of the power stroke. The intake ports are then covered or closed, and the piston moves to the top of the cylinder, compressing the charge. Following ignition and combustion, the power stroke starts with the downward movement of the piston. As the piston reaches the bottom of the power stroke, exhaust ports or valves are opened to exhaust, or scavenge, the combustion products, and a new air-to-fuel charge is injected. Two-stroke engines may be turbocharged using an exhaust-powered turbine to pressurize the charge for injection into the cylinder and to increase cylinder scavenging. Non-turbocharged engines may be either blower scavenged or piston scavenged to improve removal of combustion products. Historically, 2-stroke designs have been widely used in pipeline applications. However, current industry practices reflect a decline in the usage of new 2-stroke engines for stationary applications.

Four-stroke engines use a separate engine revolution for the intake/compression cycle and the power/exhaust cycle. These engines may be either naturally aspirated, using the suction from the piston to entrain the air charge, or turbocharged, using an exhaust-driven turbine to pressurize the charge. Turbocharged units produce a higher power output for a given engine displacement, whereas naturally aspirated units have lower initial costs and require less maintenance.

Rich-burn engines operate near the stoichiometric air-to-fuel ratio (16:1) with exhaust excess oxygen levels less than 4 percent (typically closer to 1 percent). Additionally, it is likely that the emissions profile will be considerably different for a rich-burn engine at 4 percent oxygen than when operated closer to stoichiometric conditions. Considerations such as these can impact the quantitative value of the emission factor presented. It is also important to note that while rich-burn engines may operate, by definition, with exhaust oxygen levels as high as 4 percent, in reality, most will operate within plus or minus 1 air-to-fuel ratio of stoichiometry. Even across this narrow range, emissions will vary considerably, sometimes by more than an order of magnitude. Air-to-fuel ratios were not provided in the gathered emissions data used to develop the presented factors.

Lean-burn engines may operate up to the lean flame extinction limit, with exhaust oxygen levels of 12 percent or greater. The air to fuel ratios of lean-burn engines range from 20:1 to 50:1 and are typically higher than 24:1. The exhaust excess oxygen levels of lean-burn engines are typically around 8 percent, ranging from 4 to 17 percent. Some lean-burn engines are characterized as clean-burn engines. The term "clean-burn" technology is a registered trademark of Cooper Energy Systems and refers to engines designed to reduce NO_x by operating at high air-to-fuel ratios. Engines operating at high air-to-fuel ratios (greater than 30:1) may require combustion modification to promote stable combustion with the high excess air. These modifications may include a turbo charger or a precombustion chamber (PCC). A turbo charger is used to force more air into the combustion chamber, and a PCC is used to ignite a fuel-rich mixture that propagates into the main cylinder and ignites the very lean combustion charge. Lean-burn engines typically have lower oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) emissions than rich-burn engines.

3.2.3 Emissions

The primary criteria pollutants from natural gas-fired reciprocating engines are oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), and volatile organic compounds (VOC). The formation of nitrogen oxides is exponentially related to combustion temperature in the engine cylinder. The other pollutants, CO and VOC species, are primarily the result of incomplete combustion. Particulate matter (PM) emissions include trace amounts of metals, non-combustible inorganic material, and condensible,

semi-volatile organics which result from volatized lubricating oil, engine wear, or from products of incomplete combustion. Sulfur oxides are very low since sulfur compounds are removed from natural gas at processing plants. However, trace amounts of sulfur containing odorant are added to natural gas at city gates prior to distribution for the purpose of leak detection.

It should be emphasized that the actual emissions may vary considerably from the published emission factors due to variations in the engine operating conditions. This variation is due to engines operating at different conditions, including air-to-fuel ratio, ignition timing, torque, speed, ambient temperature, humidity, and other factors. It is not unusual to test emissions from two identical engines in the same plant, operated by the same personnel, using the same fuel, and have the test results show significantly different emissions. This variability in the test data is evidenced in the high relative standard deviation reported in the data set.

3.2.3.1 Nitrogen Oxides -

Nitrogen oxides are formed through three fundamentally different mechanisms. The principal mechanism of NO_x formation with gas-fired engines is thermal NO_x. The thermal NO_x mechanism occurs through the thermal dissociation and subsequent reaction of nitrogen (N_2) and oxygen (O_2) molecules in the combustion air. Most NO_x formed through the thermal NO_x mechanism occurs in high-temperature regions in the cylinder where combustion air has mixed sufficiently with the fuel to produce the peak temperature fuel/air interface. The second mechanism, called prompt NO_x, occurs through early reactions of nitrogen molecules in the combustion air and hydrocarbon radicals from the fuel. Prompt NO_x reactions occur within the flame and are usually negligible compared to the level of NO_x formed through the thermal NO_x mechanism. The third mechanism, fuel NO_x, stems from the evolution and reaction of fuel-bound nitrogen compounds with oxygen. Natural gas has negligible chemically bound fuel nitrogen (although some molecular nitrogen is present).

Essentially all NO_x formed in natural gas-fired reciprocating engines occurs through the thermal NO_x mechanism. The formation of NO_x through the prompt NO_x mechanism may be significant only under highly controlled situations in rich-burn engines when the thermal NO_x mechanism is suppressed. The rate of NO_x formation through the thermal NO_x mechanism is highly dependent upon the stoichiometric ratio, combustion temperature, and residence time at the combustion temperature. Maximum NO_x formation occurs through the thermal NO_x mechanism near the stoichiometric air-to-fuel mixture ratio since combustion temperatures are greatest at this air-to-fuel ratio.

3.2.3.2 Carbon Monoxide and Volatile Organic Compounds -

CO and VOC emissions are both products of incomplete combustion. CO results when there is insufficient residence time at high temperature to complete the final step in hydrocarbon oxidation. In reciprocating engines, CO emissions may indicate early quenching of combustion gases on cylinder walls or valve surfaces. The oxidation of CO to carbon dioxide (CO_2) is a slow reaction compared to most hydrocarbon oxidation reactions.

The pollutants commonly classified as VOC can encompass a wide spectrum of volatile organic compounds that are photoreactive in the atmosphere. VOC occur when some of the gas remains unburned or is only partially burned during the combustion process. With natural gas, some organics are carryover, unreacted, trace constituents of the gas, while others may be pyrolysis products of the heavier hydrocarbon constituents. Partially burned hydrocarbons result from poor air-to-fuel mixing prior to, or during, combustion, or incorrect air-to-fuel ratios in the cylinder during combustion due to maladjustment of the engine fuel system. Also, low cylinder temperature may yield partially burned hydrocarbons due to excessive cooling through the walls, or early cooling of the gases by expansion of the combustion volume caused by piston motion before combustion is completed.

3.2.3.3 Particulate Matter[4] -

PM emissions result from carryover of noncombustible trace constituents in the fuel and lubricating oil and from products of incomplete combustion. Emission of PM from natural gas-fired reciprocating engines are generally minimal and comprise fine filterable and condensible PM. Increased PM emissions may result from poor air-to-fuel mixing or maintenance problems.

3.2.3.4 Carbon Dioxide, Methane, and Nitrous Oxide[5] -

Carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), and nitrous oxide (N_2O) are referred to as greenhouse gases. Such gases are largely transparent to incoming solar radiation; however, they absorb infrared radiation re-emitted by the Earth. Where available, emission factors for these pollutants are presented in the emission factors tables of this section.

3.2.4 Control Technologies

Three generic control techniques have been developed for reciprocating engines: parametric controls (timing and operating at a leaner air-to-fuel ratio); combustion modifications such as advanced engine design for new sources or major modification to existing sources (clean-burn cylinder head designs and prestratified charge combustion for rich-burn engines); and postcombustion catalytic controls installed on the engine exhaust system. Post-combustion catalytic technologies include selective catalytic reduction (SCR) for lean-burn engines; nonselective catalytic reduction (NSCR) for rich-burn engines, and CO oxidation catalysts for lean-burn engines.

3.2.4.1 Control Techniques for 4-Cycle Rich-burn Engines[4,6] -

Nonselective Catalytic Reduction (NSCR) -

This technique uses the residual hydrocarbons and CO in the rich-burn engine exhaust as a reducing agent for NO_x. In an NSCR, hydrocarbons and CO are oxidized by O_2 and NO_x. The excess hydrocarbons, CO, and NO_x pass over a catalyst (usually a noble metal such as platinum, rhodium, or palladium) that oxidizes the excess hydrocarbons and CO to H_2O and CO_2, while reducing NO_x to N_2. NO_x reduction efficiencies are usually greater than 90 percent, while CO reduction efficiencies are approximately 90 percent.

The NSCR technique is effectively limited to engines with normal exhaust oxygen levels of 4 percent or less. This includes 4-stroke rich-burn naturally aspirated engines and some 4-stroke rich-burn turbocharged engines. Engines operating with NSCR require tight air-to-fuel control to maintain high reduction effectiveness without high hydrocarbon emissions. To achieve effective NO_x reduction performance, the engine may need to be run with a richer fuel adjustment than normal. This exhaust excess oxygen level would probably be closer to 1 percent. Lean-burn engines could not be retrofitted with NSCR control because of the reduced exhaust temperatures.

Prestratified Charge -

Prestratified charge combustion is a retrofit system that is limited to 4-stroke carbureted natural gas engines. In this system, controlled amounts of air are introduced into the intake manifold in a specified sequence and quantity to create a fuel-rich and fuel-lean zone. This stratification provides both a fuel-rich ignition zone and rapid flame cooling in the fuel-lean zone, resulting in reduced formation of NO_x. A prestratified charge kit generally contains new intake manifolds, air hoses, filters, control valves, and a control system.

3.2.4.2 Control Techniques for Lean-burn Reciprocating Engines[4,6] -

Selective Catalytic Reduction[4,6] -

Selective catalytic reduction is a postcombustion technology that has been shown to be effective in reducing NO_x in exhaust from lean-burn engines. An SCR system consists of an ammonia storage, feed, and injection system, and a catalyst and catalyst housing. Selective catalytic reduction systems selectively reduce NO_x emissions by injecting ammonia (either in the form of liquid anhydrous ammonia or aqueous ammonium hydroxide) into the exhaust gas stream upstream of the catalyst. Nitrogen oxides, NH_3, and O_2 react on the surface of the catalyst to form N_2 and H_2O. For the SCR system to operate properly, the exhaust gas must be within a particular temperature range (typically between 450 and 850°F). The temperature range is dictated by the catalyst (typically made from noble metals, base metal oxides such as vanadium and titanium, and zeolite-based material). Exhaust gas temperatures greater than the upper limit (850°F) will pass the NO_x and ammonia unreacted through the catalyst. Ammonia emissions, called NH_3 slip, are a key consideration when specifying a SCR system. SCR is most suitable for lean-burn engines operated at constant loads, and can achieve efficiencies as high as 90 percent. For engines which typically operate at variable loads, such as engines on gas transmission pipelines, an SCR system may not function effectively, causing either periods of ammonia slip or insufficient ammonia to gain the reductions needed.

Catalytic Oxidation -

Catalytic oxidation is a postcombustion technology that has been applied, in limited cases, to oxidize CO in engine exhaust, typically from lean-burn engines. As previously mentioned, lean-burn technologies may cause increased CO emissions. The application of catalytic oxidation has been shown to be effective in reducing CO emissions from lean-burn engines. In a catalytic oxidation system, CO passes over a catalyst, usually a noble metal, which oxidizes the CO to CO_2 at efficiencies of approximately 70 percent for 2SLB engines and 90 percent for 4SLB engines.

3.2.5 Updates Since the Fifth Edition

The Fifth Edition was released in January 1995. Revisions to this section since that date are summarized below. For further detail, consult the memoranda describing each supplement or the background report for this section. These and other documents can be found on the Clearinghouse for Inventories/Emission Factors (CHIEF) electronic bulletin board (919-541-5742), or on the new Emission Factor and Inventory Group (EFIG) home page (http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief).

Supplement A, February 1996

- In the table for uncontrolled natural gas prime movers, the Source Classification Code (SCC) for 4-cycle lean-burn was changed from 2-01-002-53 to 2-02-002-54. The SCC for 4-cycle rich-burn was changed from 2-02-002-54 to 2-02-02-002-53.

- An SCC (2-02-002-53) was provided for 4-cycle rich-burn engines, and the "less than" symbol (<) was restored to the appropriate factors.

Supplement B, October 1996

- The introduction section was revised.

- Text was added concerning process description of turbines.

- Text concerning emissions and controls was revised.
- References in various tables were editorially corrected.
- The inconsistency between a CO_2 factor in the table and an equation in the footnote was corrected.

Supplement F, July 2000

- Turbines used for natural gas compression were removed from this section and combined with utility turbines in Section 3.1. Section 3.2 now only contains information on natural gas-fired reciprocating engines.
- All emission factors were updated based on emissions data points taken from 70 emission reports containing over 400 source tests. Many new emission factors have been incorporated in this section for speciated organic compounds, including hazardous air pollutants.

TABLE 3.2-1 UNCONTROLLED EMISSION FACTORS FOR 2-STROKE LEAN-BURN ENGINES[a]
(SCC 2-02-002-52)

Pollutant	Emission Factor (lb/MMBtu)[b] (fuel input)	Emission Factor Rating
Criteria Pollutants and Greenhouse Gases		
NO_x[c] 90 - 105% Load	3.17 E+00	A
NO_x[c] <90% Load	1.94 E+00	A
CO[c] 90 - 105% Load	3.86 E-01	A
CO[c] <90% Load	3.53 E-01	A
CO_2[d]	1.10 E+02	A
SO_2[e]	5.88 E-04	A
TOC[f]	1.64 E+00	A
Methane[g]	1.45 E+00	C
VOC[h]	1.20 E-01	C
PM10 (filterable)[i]	3.84 E-02	C
PM2.5 (filterable)[i]	3.84 E-02	C
PM Condensable[j]	9.91 E-03	E
Trace Organic Compounds		
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane[k]	6.63 E-05	C
1,1,2-Trichloroethane[k]	5.27 E-05	C
1,1-Dichloroethane	3.91 E-05	C
1,2,3-Trimethylbenzene	3.54 E-05	D
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	1.11 E-04	C
1,2-Dichloroethane	4.22 E-05	D
1,2-Dichloropropane	4.46 E-05	C
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	1.80 E-05	D
1,3-Butadiene[k]	8.20 E-04	D
1,3-Dichloropropene[k]	4.38 E-05	C
2,2,4-Trimethylpentane[k]	8.46 E-04	B
2-Methylnaphthalene[k]	2.14 E-05	C
Acenaphthene[k]	1.33 E-06	C

Table 3.2-1. UNCONTROLLED EMISSION FACTORS FOR 2-STROKE LEAN-BURN ENGINES

(Continued)

Pollutant	Emission Factor (lb/MMBtu)[b] (fuel input)	Emission Factor Rating
Acenaphthylene[k]	3.17 E-06	C
Acetaldehyde[k,l]	7.76 E-03	A
Acrolein[k,l]	7.78 E-03	A
Anthracene[k]	7.18 E-07	C
Benz(a)anthracene[k]	3.36 E-07	C
Benzene[k]	1.94 E-03	A
Benzo(a)pyrene[k]	5.68 E-09	D
Benzo(b)fluoranthene[k]	8.51 E-09	D
Benzo(e)pyrene[k]	2.34 E-08	D
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene[k]	2.48 E-08	D
Benzo(k)fluoranthene[k]	4.26 E-09	D
Biphenyl[k]	3.95 E-06	C
Butane	4.75 E-03	C
Butyr/Isobutyraldehyde	4.37 E-04	C
Carbon Tetrachloride[k]	6.07 E-05	C
Chlorobenzene[k]	4.44 E-05	C
Chloroform[k]	4.71 E-05	C
Chrysene[k]	6.72 E-07	C
Cyclohexane	3.08 E-04	C
Cyclopentane	9.47 E-05	C
Ethane	7.09 E-02	A
Ethylbenzene[k]	1.08 E-04	B
Ethylene Dibromide[k]	7.34 E-05	C
Fluoranthene[k]	3.61 E-07	C
Fluorene[k]	1.69 E-06	C
Formaldehyde[k,l]	5.52 E-02	A

Table 3.2-1. UNCONTROLLED EMISSION FACTORS FOR 2-STROKE LEAN-BURN ENGINES (Concluded)

Pollutant	Emission Factor (lb/MMBtu)[b] (fuel input)	Emission Factor Rating
Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene[k]	9.93 E-09	D
Isobutane	3.75 E-03	C
Methanol[k]	2.48 E-03	A
Methylcyclohexane	3.38 E-04	C
Methylene Chloride[k]	1.47 E-04	C
n-Hexane[k]	4.45 E-04	C
n-Nonane	3.08 E-05	C
n-Octane	7.44 E-05	C
n-Pentane	1.53 E-03	C
Naphthalene[k]	9.63 E-05	C
PAH[k]	1.34 E-04	D
Perylene[k]	4.97 E-09	D
Phenanthrene[k]	3.53 E-06	C
Phenol[k]	4.21 E-05	C
Propane	2.87 E-02	C
Pyrene[k]	5.84 E-07	C
Styrene[k]	5.48 E-05	A
Toluene[k]	9.63 E-04	A
Vinyl Chloride[k]	2.47 E-05	C
Xylene[k]	2.68 E-04	A

[a] Reference 7. Factors represent uncontrolled levels. For NO_x, CO, and PM10, "uncontrolled" means no combustion or add-on controls; however, the factor may include turbocharged units. For all other pollutants, "uncontrolled" means no oxidation control; the data set may include units with control techniques used for NOx control, such as PCC and SCR for lean burn engines, and PSC for rich burn engines. Factors are based on large population of engines. Factors are for engines at all loads, except as indicated. SCC = Source Classification Code. TOC = Total Organic Compounds. PM10 = Particulate Matter ≤ 10 microns (μm) aerodynamic diameter. A "<" sign in front of a factor means that the corresponding emission factor is based on one-half of the method detection limit.

[b] Emission factors were calculated in units of (lb/MMBtu) based on procedures in EPA

Method 19. To convert from (lb/MMBtu) to (lb/10^6 scf), multiply by the heat content of the fuel. If the heat content is not available, use 1020 Btu/scf. To convert from (lb/MMBtu) to (lb/hp-hr) use the following equation:

$$\text{lb/hp-hr} = (\text{lb/MMBtu})\ (\text{heat input, MMBtu/hr})\ (1/\text{operating HP, 1/hp})$$

[c] Emission tests with unreported load conditions were not included in the data set.

[d] Based on 99.5% conversion of the fuel carbon to CO_2. CO_2 [lb/MMBtu] = (3.67)(%CON)(C)(D)(1/h), where %CON = percent conversion of fuel carbon to CO_2, C = carbon content of fuel by weight (0.75), D = density of fuel, 4.1 E+04 lb/10^6 scf, and h = heating value of natural gas (assume 1020 Btu/scf at 60°F).

[e] Based on 100% conversion of fuel sulfur to SO_2. Assumes sulfur content in natural gas of 2,000 gr/10^6 scf.

[f] Emission factor for TOC is based on measured emission levels of 43 tests.

[g] Emission factor for methane is determined by subtracting the VOC and ethane emission factors from the TOC emission factor. Measured emission factor for methane compares well with the calculated emission factor, 1.48 lb/MMBtu vs. 1.45 lb/MMBtu, respectively.

[h] VOC emission factor is based on the sum of the emission factors for all speciated organic compounds less ethane and methane.

[i] Considered ≤ 1 μm in aerodynamic diameter. Therefore, for filterable PM emissions, PM10(filterable) = PM2.5(filterable).

[j] No data were available for condensable PM emissions. The presented emission factor reflects emissions from 4SLB engines.

[k] Hazardous Air Pollutant as defined by Section 112(b) of the Clean Air Act.

[l] For lean burn engines, aldehyde emissions quantification using CARB 430 may reflect interference with the sampling compounds due to the nitrogen concentration in the stack. The presented emission factor is based on FTIR measurements. Emissions data based on CARB 430 are available in the background report.

Table 3.2-2. UNCONTROLLED EMISSION FACTORS FOR 4-STROKE LEAN-BURN ENGINES[a]
(SCC 2-02-002-54)

Pollutant	Emission Factor (lb/MMBtu)[b] (fuel input)	Emission Factor Rating
Criteria Pollutants and Greenhouse Gases		
NO_x[c] 90 - 105% Load	4.08 E+00	B
NO_x[c] <90% Load	8.47 E-01	B
CO[c] 90 - 105% Load	3.17 E-01	C
CO[c] <90% Load	5.57 E-01	B
CO_2[d]	1.10 E+02	A
SO_2[e]	5.88 E-04	A
TOC[f]	1.47 E+00	A
Methane[g]	1.25 E+00	C
VOC[h]	1.18 E-01	C
PM10 (filterable)[i]	7.71 E-05	D
PM2.5 (filterable)[i]	7.71 E-05	D
PM Condensable[j]	9.91 E-03	D
Trace Organic Compounds		
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane[k]	<4.00 E-05	E
1,1,2-Trichloroethane[k]	<3.18 E-05	E
1,1-Dichloroethane	<2.36 E-05	E
1,2,3-Trimethylbenzene	2.30 E-05	D
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	1.43 E-05	C
1,2-Dichloroethane	<2.36 E-05	E
1,2-Dichloropropane	<2.69 E-05	E
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	3.38 E-05	D
1,3-Butadiene[k]	2.67E-04	D
1,3-Dichloropropene[k]	<2.64 E-05	E
2-Methylnaphthalene[k]	3.32 E-05	C
2,2,4-Trimethylpentane[k]	2.50 E-04	C
Acenaphthene[k]	1.25 E-06	C

Table 3.2-2. UNCONTROLLED EMISSION FACTORS FOR 4-STROKE LEAN-BURN ENGINES
(Continued)

Pollutant	Emission Factor (lb/MMBtu)[b] (fuel input)	Emission Factor Rating
Acenaphthylene[k]	5.53 E-06	C
Acetaldehyde[k,l]	8.36 E-03	A
Acrolein[k,l]	5.14 E-03	A
Benzene[k]	4.40 E-04	A
Benzo(b)fluoranthene[k]	1.66 E-07	D
Benzo(e)pyrene[k]	4.15 E-07	D
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene[k]	4.14 E-07	D
Biphenyl[k]	2.12 E-04	D
Butane	5.41 E-04	D
Butyr/Isobutyraldehyde	1.01 E-04	C
Carbon Tetrachloride[k]	<3.67 E-05	E
Chlorobenzene[k]	<3.04 E-05	E
Chloroethane	1.87 E-06	D
Chloroform[k]	<2.85 E-05	E
Chrysene[k]	6.93 E-07	C
Cyclopentane	2.27 E-04	C
Ethane	1.05 E-01	C
Ethylbenzene[k]	3.97 E-05	B
Ethylene Dibromide[k]	<4.43 E-05	E
Fluoranthene[k]	1.11 E-06	C
Fluorene[k]	5.67 E-06	C
Formaldehyde[k,l]	5.28 E-02	A
Methanol[k]	2.50 E-03	B
Methylcyclohexane	1.23 E-03	C
Methylene Chloride[k]	2.00 E-05	C
n-Hexane[k]	1.11 E-03	C
n-Nonane	1.10 E-04	C

Table 3.2-2. UNCONTROLLED EMISSION FACTORS FOR 4-STROKE LEAN-BURN ENGINES
(Continued)

Pollutant	Emission Factor (lb/MMBtu)[b] (fuel input)	Emission Factor Rating
n-Octane	3.51 E-04	C
n-Pentane	2.60 E-03	C
Naphthalene[k]	7.44 E-05	C
PAH[k]	2.69 E-05	D
Phenanthrene[k]	1.04 E-05	D
Phenol[k]	2.40 E-05	D
Propane	4.19 E-02	C
Pyrene[k]	1.36 E-06	C
Styrene[k]	<2.36 E-05	E
Tetrachloroethane[k]	2.48 E-06	D
Toluene[k]	4.08 E-04	B
Vinyl Chloride[k]	1.49 E-05	C
Xylene[k]	1.84 E-04	B

[a] Reference 7. Factors represent uncontrolled levels. For NO_x, CO, and PM10, "uncontrolled" means no combustion or add-on controls; however, the factor may include turbocharged units. For all other pollutants, "uncontrolled" means no oxidation control; the data set may include units with control techniques used for NOx control, such as PCC and SCR for lean burn engines, and PSC for rich burn engines. Factors are based on large population of engines. Factors are for engines at all loads, except as indicated. SCC = Source Classification Code. TOC = Total Organic Compounds. PM-10 = Particulate Matter ≤ 10 microns (μm) aerodynamic diameter. A "<" sign in front of a factor means that the corresponding emission factor is based on one-half of the method detection limit.

[b] Emission factors were calculated in units of (lb/MMBtu) based on procedures in EPA Method 19. To convert from (lb/MMBtu) to (lb/10^6 scf), multiply by the heat content of the fuel. If the heat content is not available, use 1020 Btu/scf. To convert from (lb/MMBtu) to (lb/hp-hr) use the following equation:

$$\text{lb/hp-hr} = (\text{lb/MMBtu})\ (\text{heat input, MMBtu/hr})\ (1/\text{operating HP, 1/hp})$$

[c] Emission tests with unreported load conditions were not included in the data set.

[d] Based on 99.5% conversion of the fuel carbon to CO_2. CO_2 [lb/MMBtu] = (3.67)(%CON)(C)(D)(1/h), where %CON = percent conversion of fuel carbon to CO_2, C = carbon content of fuel by weight (0.75), D = density of fuel, 4.1 E+04 lb/10^6 scf, and

h = heating value of natural gas (assume 1020 Btu/scf at 60°F).

[e] Based on 100% conversion of fuel sulfur to SO_2. Assumes sulfur content in natural gas of 2,000 gr/10^6scf.

[f] Emission factor for TOC is based on measured emission levels from 22 source tests.

[g] Emission factor for methane is determined by subtracting the VOC and ethane emission factors from the TOC emission factor. Measured emission factor for methane compares well with the calculated emission factor, 1.31 lb/MMBtu vs. 1.25 lb/MMBtu, respectively.

[h] VOC emission factor is based on the sum of the emission factors for all speciated organic compounds less ethane and methane.

[i] Considered ≤ 1 μm in aerodynamic diameter. Therefore, for filterable PM emissions, PM10(filterable) = PM2.5(filterable).

[j] PM Condensable = PM Condensable Inorganic + PM-Condensable Organic

[k] Hazardous Air Pollutant as defined by Section 112(b) of the Clean Air Act.

[l] For lean burn engines, aldehyde emissions quantification using CARB 430 may reflect interference with the sampling compounds due to the nitrogen concentration in the stack. The presented emission factor is based on FTIR measurements. Emissions data based on CARB 430 are available in the background report.

Table 3.2-3. UNCONTROLLED EMISSION FACTORS FOR 4-STROKE RICH-BURN ENGINES[a]
(SCC 2-02-002-53)

Pollutant	Emission Factor (lb/MMBtu)[b] (fuel input)	Emission Factor Rating
Criteria Pollutants and Greenhouse Gases		
NO_x[c] 90 - 105% Load	2.21 E+00	A
NO_x[c] <90% Load	2.27 E+00	C
CO[c] 90 - 105% Load	3.72 E+00	A
CO[c] <90% Load	3.51 E+00	C
CO_2[d]	1.10 E+02	A
SO_2[e]	5.88 E-04	A
TOC[f]	3.58 E-01	C
Methane[g]	2.30 E-01	C
VOC[h]	2.96 E-02	C
PM10 (filterable)[i,j]	9.50 E-03	E
PM2.5 (filterable)[j]	9.50 E-03	E
PM Condensable[k]	9.91 E-03	E
Trace Organic Compounds		
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane[l]	2.53 E-05	C
1,1,2-Trichloroethane[l]	<1.53 E-05	E
1,1-Dichloroethane	<1.13 E-05	E
1,2-Dichloroethane	<1.13 E-05	E
1,2-Dichloropropane	<1.30 E-05	E
1,3-Butadiene[l]	6.63 E-04	D
1,3-Dichloropropene[l]	<1.27 E-05	E
Acetaldehyde[l,m]	2.79 E-03	C
Acrolein[l,m]	2.63 E-03	C
Benzene[l]	1.58 E-03	B
Butyr/isobutyraldehyde	4.86 E-05	D
Carbon Tetrachloride[l]	<1.77 E-05	E

Table 3.2-3. UNCONTROLLED EMISSION FACTORS FOR 4-STROKE RICH-BURN ENGINES (Concluded)

Pollutant	Emission Factor (lb/MMBtu)[b] (fuel input)	Emission Factor Rating
Chlorobenzene[l]	<1.29 E-05	E
Chloroform[l]	<1.37 E-05	E
Ethane[n]	7.04 E-02	C
Ethylbenzene[l]	<2.48 E-05	E
Ethylene Dibromide[l]	<2.13 E-05	E
Formaldehyde[l,m]	2.05 E-02	A
Methanol[l]	3.06 E-03	D
Methylene Chloride[l]	4.12 E-05	C
Naphthalene[l]	<9.71 E-05	E
PAH[l]	1.41 E-04	D
Styrene[l]	<1.19 E-05	E
Toluene[l]	5.58 E-04	A
Vinyl Chloride[l]	<7.18 E-06	E
Xylene[l]	1.95 E-04	A

[a] Reference 7. Factors represent uncontrolled levels. For NO_x, CO, and PM-10, "uncontrolled" means no combustion or add-on controls; however, the factor may include turbocharged units. For all other pollutants, "uncontrolled" means no oxidation control; the data set may include units with control techniques used for NOx control, such as PCC and SCR for lean burn engines, and PSC for rich burn engines. Factors are based on large population of engines. Factors are for engines at all loads, except as indicated. SCC = Source Classification Code. TOC = Total Organic Compounds. PM10 = Particulate Matter ≤ 10 microns (μm) aerodynamic diameter. A "<" sign in front of a factor means that the corresponding emission factor is based on one-half of the method detection limit.

[b] Emission factors were calculated in units of (lb/MMBtu) based on procedures in EPA Method 19. To convert from (lb/MMBtu) to (lb/10^6 scf), multiply by the heat content of the fuel. If the heat content is not available, use 1020 Btu/scf. To convert from (lb/MMBtu) to (lb/hp-hr) use the following equation:

$$\text{lb/hp-hr} = (\text{lb/MMBtu})(\text{heat input, MMBtu/hr})(1/\text{operating HP, 1/hp})$$

[c] Emission tests with unreported load conditions were not included in the data set.

[d] Based on 99.5% conversion of the fuel carbon to CO_2. CO_2 [lb/MMBtu] = (3.67)(%CON)(C)(D)(1/h), where %CON = percent conversion of fuel carbon to CO_2,

C = carbon content of fuel by weight (0.75), D = density of fuel, 4.1 E+04 lb/10^6 scf, and h = heating value of natural gas (assume 1020 Btu/scf at 60°F).

[e] Based on 100% conversion of fuel sulfur to SO_2. Assumes sulfur content in natural gas of 2,000 gr/10^6scf.

[f] Emission factor for TOC is based on measured emission levels from 6 source tests.

[g] Emission factor for methane is determined by subtracting the VOC and ethane emission factors from the TOC emission factor.

[h] VOC emission factor is based on the sum of the emission factors for all speciated organic compounds. Methane and ethane emissions were not measured for this engine category.

[i] No data were available for uncontrolled engines. PM10 emissions are for engines equipped with a PCC.

[j] Considered ≤ 1 μm in aerodynamic diameter. Therefore, for filterable PM emissions, PM10(filterable) = PM2.5(filterable).

[k] No data were available for condensable emissions. The presented emission factor reflects emissions from 4SLB engines.

[l] Hazardous Air Pollutant as defined by Section 112(b) of the Clean Air Act.

[m] For rich-burn engines, no interference is suspected in quantifying aldehyde emissions. The presented emission factors are based on FTIR and CARB 430 emissions data measurements.

[n] Ethane emission factor is determined by subtracting the VOC emission factor from the NMHC emission factor.

References For Section 3.2

1. *Engines, Turbines, And Compressors Directory*, American Gas Association, Catalog #XF0488.

2. *Standards Support And Environmental Impact Statement, Volume I: Stationary Internal Combustion Engines*, EPA-450/2-78-125a, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, NC, July 1979.

3. *Alternative Control Techniques Document - NO_x Emissions From Stationary Reciprocating Engines*, EPA-453/R-93-032, July 1993.

4. *Handbook - Control Technologies For Hazardous Air Pollutants*, EPA-625/6-91-014, June 1991.

5. *Limiting Net Greenhouse Gas Emissions In The United States, Volume II: Energy Responses,* Report for the Office of Environmental Analysis, Office of Policy, Planning and Analysis, Department of Energy (DOE), DOE/PE-0101 Volume II, September 1991.

6. C. Castaldini, *NO_x Reduction Technologies For Natural Gas Industry Prime Movers*, GRI-90/0215, Gas Research Institute, Chicago, IL, August 1990.

7. *Emission Factor Documentation for AP-42 Section 3.2, Natural Gas-Fired Reciprocating Engines*, EPA Contract No. 68-D2-0160, Alpha-Gamma Technologies, Inc., Raleigh, North Carolina, July 2000.

3.2 BACKGROUND DOCUMENT

EMISSION FACTOR DOCUMENTATION FOR AP-42 SECTION 3.2, NATURAL GAS-FIRED RECIPROCATING ENGINES

Prepared for:

Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards
Emissions, Monitoring, and Analysis Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Research Triangle Park, NC

Prepared by:

Alpha-Gamma Technologies, Inc.
4700 Falls of Neuse Road, Suite 350
Raleigh, NC 27609

July 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
1.0	Introduction	1.1
1.1	Reasons For Updating	1.1
1.2	References For Section 1	1.2
2.0	Literature Search And Screening	2.1
2.1	Review Of Data Sets	2.1
2.2	Emission Data Quality Rating System	2.2
2.3	References For Section 2	2.4
3.0	AP-42 Section Development	3.1
3.1	Revisions to Section Narrative	3.1
3.2	Pollutant Emission Factor Development	3.1
3.2.1	Data Base Design	3.1
3.2.2	Results Of Data Analysis	3.7
3.3	Emission Factor Quality Rating System	3.13
3.4	Emission Factors	3.14
3.5	References For Section 3	3.25
4.0	Revised AP-42 Section 3.2	4.1

Appendix A - Section 3-2 Source Tests Reports Information.

TABLES

Page

3.2-1. SCR Test Results (NO_x) 3.11

3.2-2. NSCR Test Results (NO_x) 3.11

3.2-3. Catalytic Oxidation Test Results for 2SLB Engines (CO) 3.12

3.2-4. Catalytic Oxidation Test Results for 4SLB Engines (CO) 3.13

3.4-1. Uncontrolled Emission Factors For 2-stroke Lean-burn Engines 3.15

3.4-2. Uncontrolled Emission Factors For 4-stroke Lean-burn Engines 3.20

3.4-3. Uncontrolled Emission Factors For 4-stroke Rich-burn Engines 3.24

Emission Factor Documentation for AP-42 Section 3.2
Natural Gas-fired Reciprocating Engines

1.0 Introduction

The revised AP-42 section described in this report replaces the section published in September 1996 as Supplement B to the Fifth Edition. This background report replaces the Emission Factor (EF) Documentation for AP-42 section 3.2, Heavy-Duty Natural Gas-Fired Pipeline Compressor Engines, issued February 1993 and amended in 1996 to support Supplement B of the Fifth Edition. The purpose of this background report is to provide technical documentation supporting the revisions to AP-42 section 3.2.

EPA publishes emission factors in its Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, Volume I, Stationary Point and Area Sources, EPA Publication No. AP-42 (AP-42). The document has been published since 1968 as the primary compilation of EPA's emission factor information. Federal, state, and local agencies, consultants, and industry use the document to identify major contributors of atmospheric pollutants, develop emission control strategies, determine applicability of permitting programs, and compile emission inventories for ambient air impact analyses and State Implementation Plans (SIPs). Volume 1, Stationary Sources is published by Emission Factor Inventory Group (EFIG) in EPA's Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (OAQPS). The OAQPS is located in Research Triangle Park, NC.

1.1 Reasons For Updating

The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 added greatly to the number of air pollution sources for which emission factor development was required, and also called for the improvement of existing factors. There are several reasons for updating or revising AP-42 sections and emission factors.

- Contractor Expertise. A contractor or consultant may have gained expertise on a source category during previous work, either for EPA or for other clients, and may warrant consideration by EPA for a relatively low-expense update and expansion of available information.

- New Standard. After the proposal of a standard, the contractor reviews the available material to determine if sufficient information has been gathered to support the development of emission factors for the industry or process being studied. Often, the proposal or development of a new standard for a source or source category will trigger a re-evaluation of emission factors for a particular source. In the proposal of a standard, the proposal team gathers substantial amounts of data to support the standard, much more data than is typically gathered for AP-42. The proposal team may compare their new data with existing information used to develop AP-42 emission factors. If, in the comparison, the team discovers a deficiency in the existing information, they may turn their data over to EFIG, who in turn may use the information to improve emission factors.

- Outside Requests. EPA receives requests for better source and emission factor information. Requests may come from other OAQPS branches, EPA laboratories and

regional offices, state agencies, trade associations, special interest groups, or private individuals. The requests may take the form of directives, letters, oral inquiries, or comments on published emission factors.

- Improve the National Inventory. The EPA may determine that a particular source category is a significant contributor to the National Inventory and that EPA should develop or improve emission factors.

- New Information. New information will be useful that may have been developed initially for Emission Standards Division (ESD) background documents involving New Source Performance Standards, Maximum Achievable Control Technologies (MACT), National Emission Standards For Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP), and Control Techniques Guidelines (CTG), and reports by various EPA laboratories.

Section 3.2 has been updated to incorporate new available data on this source category. New information has been used to better characterize this source category, develop improved volatile organic compound (VOC) and particulate matter (PM) emission factors, and update criteria pollutant emission factors. In response to upcoming MACT standards for this source category, an expanded hazardous air pollutant (HAP) emission factors have also been provided.

This background report consists of four sections. This introduction provides background information on AP-42 and documents such as this one that are issued to update sections of AP-42. Section 2 presents the data search and screening steps, discusses the references used to revise Section 3.2, and defines the emissions data quality rating system. Section 3 discusses overall revisions to this section, provides details about the data base built for storing the available data, presents the calculations used to calculate emission factors, and defines the emission factor quality rating system. Section 4 presents the revised AP-42 section 3.2. Appendix A presents general information for the emissions test reports used in developing the emission factors.

1.2 REFERENCES FOR SECTION 1

1. *Procedures for Preparing Emission Factor Documents*, EPA-454/R-95-015, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, U.S. EPA, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711, November 1997.

2.0 Literature Search And Screening

Data used in this section were obtained from a number of sources within the OAQPS and from outside organizations. The AP-42 Background files were reviewed for information on these engines, demonstrated pollution control technologies, and emissions data. The Factor Information Retrieval System (FIRE) was searched for emissions data on natural gas-fired engines. The Source Test Information Retrieval System (STIRS) data set, compiled by EFIG, was reviewed and provided emissions data from several engine tests. The STIRS data set is a collection of emission test reports that have been scanned and stored on CD-ROM. Emissions tests on several engines were obtained from an industry report recently published by the Gas Research Institute (GRI).

In the review of available references, emissions data were accepted if:

- sufficient information about the engine and any pollution control devices was given.
- the test report identified if the emission tests were conducted before or after a pollution control device.
- emissions levels were measured by a current test method.
- emission test results were reported in units which could be converted into the reporting units selected for this section.
- sufficient data existed to characterize operating conditions.

2.1 Review Of Data Sets

Since Supplement B to the fifth edition was published, EPA has initiated several efforts towards gathering emissions data for combustion sources, including stationary reciprocating internal combustion engines. These efforts include the STIRS and the ICCR efforts. Under the STIRS program, EPA's EFIG group searched state files for emission test results from point sources. Under the ICCR program, industry representatives provided EPA with review of gathered emission reports and with additional emissions data for units in their operations. In addition, EPA with participation from industry and engine manufacturers, has conducted emissions testing on three lean burn engines (two gas-fired engines and one diesel-fired engine) at Colorado State University (CSU). The objective of this testing campaign were to determine the effect of potential control technologies and engine operating conditions on HAPs emissions. Simultaneous emissions measurements of before and after control devices were obtained. The control devices evaluated were CO oxidation catalysts, and the CSU engines were tested for HAPs and criteria pollutants. In addition to EPA's efforts, the Gas Research Institute (GRI) has completed several emission testing program and published the results of their efforts in comprehensive reports on criteria, non-criteria, and toxic pollutant emissions from natural gas-fired engines. These reports are entitled *Measurement of Air Toxic Emissions from Natural Gas-Fired Internal Combustion Engines at Natural Gas Transmission and Storage Facilities* and *Measurement of Air Toxic Emissions from Combustion Equipments at Natural Gas Processing Plants*, emissions database report ID numbers 29 and 31, respectively. These reports provides extensive process and emissions data from 68 tests on different engine types. The data from these reports provide emissions (NO_x, CO, TOC, PM, speciated VOCs, speciated PAHs) in units of ppmvd, ppmvw, *ug*/dscf, gr/dscf, with associated engine operating parameters (horsepower, rpm, fuel analysis, fuel flow, exhaust flow, exhaust O_2). Furthermore, several

tests were conducted on engines operating with selective catalytic reduction (SCR), non-selective catalytic reduction (NSCR), and catalytic oxidation.

The background documents in the reference file assembled for the previous AP-42 version were also reviewed. Data from this source were accepted if the source tests were conducted recently (within the past 10 years) with currently approved test methods and if sufficient process data were available to characterize engine operation. Based on this review, no emissions data were incorporated into the data set for this version.

A total of 71 emissions test reports containing 469 emissions tests were gathered for stationary internal combustion engines. In most cases, the test reports included pooled testing efforts for several engines. Due to the large amount of gathered source tests, EPA decided to base the emission factors for Section 3.2 on original emissions data (actual source tests). The GRI testing efforts, References 1 and 2, were also included in the development of the emission factors due to the extensive amount of emissions and operating information that are included.

Detailed information for each test report used for developing the presented emission factors in Section 3.2 of the AP-42 Document is provided in the emissions data base for the section. Refer to Section 3.2.1 of this background report for instructions on how to obtain, use, and review the gathered emissions data for stationary reciprocating internal combustion engines.

A summary of the emission tests used to develop emission factors and their associated data base identification numbers is presented for each developed emission factor in Section 3.4, Tables 3.4-1 through 3.4-3. Nearly all of the emission test data used for developing the emission factors were assigned a rating of A due to the detailed information provided. These references are source test reports for natural gas-fired stationary reciprocating internal combustion engines used for electric generation, gas transmission and production, and industrial uses. A total of 71 test reports containing 469 emission tests were gathered for engines firing natural gas. Out of the 71 test reports, 61 test reports containing 324 emission tests included reference to the engine type (e.g., 2SLB, 4SLB, or 4SRB) and were used to develop the emission factors for this section. The breakdown of the number of test reports and tests used for developing the emission factors per engine category is as follows: for 2SLB engines, 18 test reports containing 120 emission tests; for 4SLB engines, 18 test reports containing 93 emission tests; and for 4SRB engines, 25 test reports containing 111 emission tests. Some of these test reports included controlled emissions data. The type of control devices tested include add-on catalysts; such as, selective catalytic reduction (SCR), non-selective catalytic reduction (NSCR), and CO-Catalyst; and combustion process modification; such as, pre-combustion chamber (PCC).

Only uncontrolled emission factors for both criteria and HAP emissions are presented in the revision of Section 3.2 of AP-42. Controlled emission factors can be obtained from the emissions database provided with this background documentation. Refer to Section 3.2.1 of this background report for instructions on how to obtain, use, and review the gathered emissions data for stationary reciprocating internal combustion engines.

2.2 Emission Data Quality Rating System

As part of the emission data analysis, the quality of the information contained in the set of reference documents was evaluated. Source test reports were considered to have sound methodology and adequate detail if they met the following criteria:

1. Source operation. The manner in which the source was operated is well documented in the report. The source was operating within typical parameters during the test.

2. Sampling procedures. The sampling procedures conformed to a generally acceptable methodology. The emission tests were conducted using a current measurement method. If actual procedures deviated from accepted methods, the deviations are well documented. When this occurred, an evaluation was made of the extent to which such alternative procedures could influence the test results.

3. Sampling and process data. Adequate sampling and process data are documented in the report, and any variations in the sampling and process operation are noted. If a large range between test results cannot be explained by information contained in the test report, the data are suspect and are given a lower rating.

4. Analysis and calculations. The test reports contain original raw data sheets. The nomenclature and equations used were compared to those (if any) specified by EPA to establish equivalency. The depth of review of the calculations was dictated by the reviewer's confidence in the ability and conscientiousness of the tester, which in turn was based on factors such as consistency of results and completeness of other areas of the test report.

After the source test reports were deemed acceptable based on the aforementioned criteria, data contained in these reports that were used to calculate emission factors were assigned a quality rating. The rating system used was that specified by OAQPS for preparing AP-42 sections.[1] The data were rated as follows:

A- Multiple tests that were performed on the same source using sound methodology and reported in enough detail for adequate validation. These tests do not necessarily conform to the methodology specified in EPA reference test methods, although these methods were used as a guide for the methodology actually used.

B - Tests that were performed by a generally sound methodology, but lack enough detail for adequate validation.

C - Tests that were based on an untested or new methodology or that lacked a significant amount of background data.

D - Tests that were based on a generally unacceptable method but may provide an order-of-magnitude value for the source.

2.3 REFERENCES FOR SECTION 2

1. *Procedures for Preparing Emission Factor Documents*, EPA-454/R-95-015, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, U.S. EPA, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711, November 1997.

3.0 AP-42 Section Development

3.1 Revisions to Section Narrative

The main change to Section 3.2 in AP-42 was to move turbines to Section 3.1 of AP-42. The EPA decided that a more effective method of presenting data for engines and turbines was to give each of these source categories an individual section. In this revised version of Section 3.2, only reciprocating, natural gas-fired, internal combustion engines are addressed. All combustion turbines have been combined into Section 3.1.

Overall, the technical discussion in this section was appropriate. There were no significant technological changes in this source category identified since the last publication. Some of the discussion on pollutant formation was revised to better characterize emissions from this source category. For example, discussions on particulate matter (PM) from these engines were revised to reflect improvements in measurement technologies. In previous versions, PM from these engines were considered below measurement detection levels. However, PM emissions from these engines can be measured using newer techniques and the text required revision to characterize these pollutants.

As for emissions information, the most significant change to the previous section is the amount of emissions data used for developing the e missions data, and the inclusion of an emissions database summarizing the gathered information. EPA has gathered 71 source test reports containing 469 emissions tests for HAPs and criteria pollutants for stationary reciprocating internal combustion engines, of which 61 test reports and 324 emissions tests were used in the development of the emission factors presented in Section 3.2. The remaining test reports were not used due to lack of essential information regarding the engine family during testing. A further discussion of the emissions data is presented in Section 3.2.2.

3.2 Pollutant Emission Factor Development

3.2.1 Data Base Design

The emission data assembled for the development of engine emission factors was stored in a Microsoft Access data base, Access 97. A data base approach was chosen to easily access and manipulate the large amount of data collected for this section and to facilitate data transfer within other concurrent projects at EPA. The design of this data base was accomplished in conjunction with the former Industrial Combustion Coordinated Rulemaking (ICCR) effort ongoing within the Emission Standards Division (ESD). Data entered under either of these projects was easily transferred between data bases. Furthermore, the common design of the data base will allow for future additions to the data base and simple recalculation of engine emission factors.

Within the data base, data was stored in two tables to reduce repetitive entry of data. These tables, and the data fields associated with each table are as follows:

Facilities Table

- Facility name
- Location
- Testing Company
- Date of Test

- Engine Manufacturer
- Engine Model
- Engine Family (2-stroke lean-burn, 4-stroke rich-burn, etc.)
- Air Supply (turbocharged, naturally aspirated, etc.)
- Number of Cylinders
- Rated Horsepower
- Test Horsepower
- Load
- Fuel Type
- Fuel Higher Heating Value
- Post-combustion Emission Controls

Test Data Table

- Pollutant
- Test Method
- Pollutant Concentration (as reported)
- Detection Limit
- Exhaust Oxygen Percentage
- Data Rating
- Fuel Exhaust Factor (F-Factor)
- Exhaust Flow Rate
- Fuel Flow Rate
- Exhaust Moisture Fraction
- Molecular Weight of Pollutant

The data base was programmed to merge the data in the two tables and calculate emission factors for the available pollutants in units of part per billion at 15 percent O_2 (ppb), pounds per million British thermal units (lb/MMBtu), pounds per hour (lb/hr), and pounds per horsepower-hour (lb/hp-hr). To ensure consistent calculation of emission factors, the data base was programmed to use the emission concentration data and process data taken during the testing period to calculate the emission factors. Emission factors provided in test reports were not used. The EPA concluded that this method of calculation would provide the highest quality emission factors. This method of calculating emission factors was chosen because different methods of calculating emission factors were used in some of the references and in some cases, the method of calculating emission factors was not given. Equations used to calculate emission factors for this section rely on the pollutant concentration units and on the desired emission factor.

The following equations were used to convert concentration data to the selected emission factors used in this section.

For concentration in parts per million by volume - dry (ppmvd), the following equations were used:

$$(1) \qquad EF_{lb/MMBtu} = \frac{(C_{ppmvd} \cdot F \cdot MW)}{(10^6 \cdot 385.5)} \cdot \text{temperature correction} \cdot \text{oxygen correction}$$

(2) $$EF_{lb/MMscf} \cdot \frac{(C_{ppmvd} \cdot F \cdot 1020 \cdot MW)}{(10^6 \cdot 385.5)} \cdot \text{temperature correction} \cdot \text{oxygen correction}$$

(3) $$EF_{lb/hr} \cdot \frac{(C_{ppmvd} \cdot Q_{out} \cdot 60 \cdot MW)}{(10^6 \cdot 385.5)} \cdot \text{temperature correction}$$

(4) $$EF_{lb/hp \cdot hr} \cdot \frac{(C_{ppmvd} \cdot Q_{out} \cdot 60 \cdot MW)}{(hp \cdot 10^6 \cdot 385.5)} \cdot \text{temperature correction}$$

For concentration in parts per million by volume - wet (ppmvw), the following equations were used:

(5) $$EF_{lb/MMBtu} \cdot \frac{(C_{ppmvw} \cdot F \cdot MW)}{(10^6 \cdot 385.5) \cdot (1 \cdot W_c)} \cdot \text{temperature correction} \cdot \text{oxygen correction}$$

(6) $$EF_{lb/MMscf} \cdot \frac{(C_{ppmvw} \cdot F \cdot 1020 \cdot MW)}{(10^6 \cdot 385.5) \cdot (1 \cdot W_c)} \cdot \text{temperature correction} \cdot \text{oxygen correction}$$

(7) $$EF_{lb/hr} \cdot \frac{(C_{ppmvw} \cdot Q_{out} \cdot 60 \cdot MW)}{(10^6 \cdot (1 \cdot Wc) \cdot 385.5)} \cdot \text{temperature correction}$$

(8) $$EF_{lb/hp \cdot hr} \cdot \frac{(C_{ppmvw} \cdot Q_{out} \cdot 60 \cdot MW)}{(hp \cdot 10^6 \cdot (1 \cdot Wc) \cdot 385.5)} \cdot \text{temperature correction}$$

For concentration in micrograms per dry standard cubic feet, the following equations were used:

(9) $$EF_{lb/MMBtu} \cdot \frac{(C_{ugf} \cdot F)}{(10^6 \cdot 453.6)} \cdot \text{oxygen correction}$$

(10) $$EF_{lb/MMscf} \cdot \frac{(C_{ugf} \cdot F \cdot 1020)}{(10^6 \cdot 453.6)} \cdot \text{oxygen correction}$$

(11) $$EF_{lb/hr} \cdot \frac{(C_{ugf} \cdot Q_{out} \cdot 60)}{(10^6 \cdot 453.6)}$$

(12) $$EF_{lb/hp \cdot hr} \cdot \frac{(C_{ugf} \cdot Q_{out} \cdot 60)}{(hp \cdot 10^6 \cdot 453.6)}$$

For concentration in parts per billion by volume - dry, the following equations were used:

(13) $$EF_{lb/MMBtu} \cdot \frac{(Cppbvd \cdot F \cdot MW)}{(10^9 \cdot 385.5)} \cdot \text{temperature correction} \cdot \text{oxygen correction}$$

(14) $$EF_{lb/hr} \cdot \frac{(C_{ppbvd} \cdot Qout \cdot 60)}{(10^9 \cdot 385.5)} \cdot \text{temperature correction}$$

(15) $$EF_{lb/hp \cdot hr} \cdot \frac{(C_{ppbvd} \cdot Qout \cdot 60)}{(hp \cdot 10^9 \cdot 385.5)} \cdot \text{temperature correction}$$

For concentration in volume percent, the following equations were used:

(16) $$EF_{lb/MMBtu} \cdot \frac{(C_{\%} \cdot F \cdot MW)}{(100 \cdot 385.5)} \cdot \text{temperature correction} \cdot \text{oxygen correction}$$

(17) $$EF_{lb/hp \cdot hr} \cdot \frac{(C_{\%} \cdot Q_{out} \cdot 60 \cdot MW)}{(hp \cdot 100 \cdot 385.5)} \cdot \text{temperature correction}$$

For concentration in nanograms per dry standard cubic feet, the following equations were used:

$$(18) \qquad EF_{lb/MMBtu} = \frac{(C_{ngf} \cdot F)}{(10^9 \cdot 453.6)} \cdot \text{oxygen correction}$$

$$(19) \qquad EF_{lb/hp \cdot hr} = \frac{(C_{ngf} \cdot Q_{out} \cdot 60)}{(hp \cdot 10^9 \cdot 453.6)}$$

For concentration in grains/dscf, the following equations were used:

$$(20) \qquad EF_{lb/MMBtu} = (C_{grf} \cdot F \cdot 1.43 \cdot 10^{-4}) \cdot \text{oxygen correction}$$

$$(21) \qquad EF_{lb/hp \cdot hr} = \frac{(C_{grf} \cdot Q_{out} \cdot 60 \cdot 1.43 \cdot 10^{-4})}{(hp)} \cdot \text{oxygen correction}$$

For concentration in micrograms per dry standard cubic meter, the following equations were used:

$$(22) \qquad EF_{lb/MMBtu} = \frac{(C_{ugm} \cdot F)}{(10^6 \cdot 453.6 \cdot 35.31)} \cdot \text{oxygen correction}$$

$$(23) \qquad EF_{lb/hp \cdot hr} = \frac{(C_{ugm} \cdot Q_{out} \cdot 60 \cdot)}{(hp \cdot 10^6 \cdot 453.6 \cdot 35.31)}$$

Where:

EF_{MMBtu}	=	Emission factor (pounds per million Btu)
EF_{hp}	=	Emission factor (pounds per horsepower-hour)
EF_{MMscf}	=	Emission factor (pounds per million standard cubic feet or fuel input)
C_{ppmvd}	=	Concentration (parts per million by volume, dry)

C_{ppmvw}	=	Concentration (parts per million by volume, wet)
C_{ugf}	=	Concentration (micrograms per dry standard cubic foot)
C_{ppbvd}	=	Concentration (parts per billion by volume, dry)
$C_{\%}$	=	Concentration (percent by volume)
C_{ngf}	=	Concentration (nanograms per dry standard cubic foot)
C_{grf}	=	Concentration (grains per dry standard cubic foot)
C_{ugm}	=	Concentration (micrograms per dry standard cubic meter)
Q_{out}	=	Stack exhaust flow rate (dry standard cubic feet per minute)
F	=	F-Factor (dry standard cubic feet per million Btu as referenced in the test report Default values obtained from 40 CFR 60, App. A, Table 19-1)
MW	=	Molecular weight (pounds per pound-mole)
hp	=	Power output (break horsepower)
T_{test}	=	Test temperature (•F)
$\%O_2$	=	Percent of oxygen is exhaust, by volume
1020	=	Natural gas heating value (MMBtu per MMscf)
385.5	=	Volume occupied by 1 lb-mole at 68•F and 14.7 psia (standard cubic feet per lb-mole)
60	=	Conversion factor (minutes per hour)
W_c	=	Water vapor volume fraction in exhaust
453.6	=	Conversion factor (grams per pound)
$1.43*10^{-4}$	=	Conversion factor (pounds per grain)
35.31	=	Conversion factor (dry standard cubic feet per dry standard cubic meter)

$$\text{Temperature correction (to 68•F)} \bullet \left(\frac{528 \bullet R_{std}}{460 \bullet R_t \bullet T_{test} \bullet F} \right)$$

$$\text{Oxygen correction (to 0\% } O_2) \bullet \left(\frac{20.9}{20.9 \bullet \%O_2} \right)$$

Detection Limits

For cases where the concentration of a specific pollutant was below the test method detection limit and a detection limit was provided, one half of the detection limit was used to calculate an emission factor. If no detection limit was provided, then the results from that test were not used. Furthermore, if an emission factor for an individual engine was developed from a detection limit and the resulting emission factor was higher than the emission factors generated from detected concentrations, then the emission factor based on a detection limit was removed from the average. The goal of this decision was to prevent unusually high detection limit from artificially increasing an average emission factor. If an average emission factor was generated entirely from detection limits and not on measured values, a "less than" indicator was printed beside the emission factor presented in AP-42. Furthermore, it is noted as an emission factor based on detection limits and that expected emissions are lower than the emission factor. These methods for addressing detection level issues were provided in the Procedures For Preparing Emission Factor Documents.[1]

Calculation of Average Emission Factors

To provide average emission factors for each engine group, the emission factors from all tests in a specific group were averaged to generate the engine group emission factor. The averaging method used in the data base was an arithmetic average. For tests that consisted of multiple runs, the arithmetic average of the runs was used to develop the emission factor of that test. Tests from the same engine (same unit and location, such as CSU tests) and same operating conditions, such as load, are grouped and averaged as one test. For such cases, the average factor presented in the emissions data base will not match the factor presented in the AP-42 section. Individual tests were given equal weight in the calculation of average emission factors for each engine group. If the data used to generate an emission factor were from non-detect results where one half of the detection limit was used, then the average emission factor was noted to be made up of mostly detection limit estimates. The EPA intends for average emission factors generated from detection limits to provide an order of magnitude estimate of emissions levels. This type of emission factor is given a low quality rating.

Presentation of Data

Due to the size of the data base, a printout of all test data used to generate the engine emission factors in Section 3.2 is not presented. Instead, EPA is providing an electronic copy of the data base in Microsoft Access format on the EPA Technology Transfer Network (TTN). This has substantially decreased the volume of this background information document and will provide users with a more detailed background data set for this section. Furthermore, by providing the data base to the public, anyone may use or augment the data base for their individual needs, providing a substantial building block to there interested in compiling an extensive data base on natural gas-fired reciprocating engines. An electronic copy of the data base can be downloaded from the TTN at http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief. In this website, follow the main menu options to locate the file and then download it.

To view the tests used to calculate the emission factors calculated for theses sources, open the data base file which will automatically open the MAIN FORM view (in case where the MAIN FORM does not open, open the file and choose the FORMS selection on the main data base screen, then under the FORMS selection, choose MAIN FORM). This will activate a macro which will provide a pollutant list, fuel type, and control device type available for these sources. This provides the option to view the input data, source information, or the emission tests used to calculate the emission factor for a specific pollutant (based on fuel type and control information) by simply clicking on the desired button: To view the data used to calculate the average emission factor for each test, click the EF INPUTS button; to view the individual source information, click the VIEW FACILITIES button; to view the data used for calculating the emission factor, click the EF REPORT button.

Several test reports did not include sufficient information necessary for characterizing the engine family. These reports were not used in developing the presented emission factors for Section 3.2. To view a summary of these reports, please refer to the Report Section in the emissions database and select the report entitled, "Reports Not Used in EF Development."

3.2.2 Results Of Data Analysis

Source Category Selection

An important step in emission factor development is to determine which emission sources are similar enough to be grouped together and be represented by a single emission factor. This is accomplished by investigating which factors influence emissions and should be used to establish engine

categories. The emission factors for each test contained in the data base were analyzed to determine appropriate categories.

When the emission levels of NO_x, CO, total hydrocarbons, and formaldehyde were compared against the different engine types (i.e., 2-stroke lean-burn, 4-stroke lean-burn, and 4-stroke rich-burn) emission profiles exhibited noticeable differences between the different types. The differences in emission profiles across these engine types are due to the different combustion parameters (i.e., temperature, oxygen concentration, residence time) that are specific to these engine types. For example, lean-burn engines operate with exhaust oxygen levels around 8 percent. These levels of excess air are effective in reducing NO_x emissions because the increased nitrogen and oxygen content in the fuel/air mixture acts as diluent to lower overall combustion temperatures, thus suppressing the thermal NO_x formation temperature. However, the cooler combustion temperatures lead to increased CO and hydrocarbon emissions.

Emission levels of NO_x, CO, total hydrocarbons, and formaldehyde were also compared against engine size and operating load. These parameters were studied to evaluate their effect on emissions and to determine if further segregation of engine categories was needed. Within the scatter of the data, size showed no consistent effect on the emission levels of NO_x, CO, total hydrocarbons, or formaldehyde for any of the engine types. Load showed the highest effect on NO_x and CO emissions. However, the EPA was not able to develop an algorithm that relates NO_x or CO to load. Therefore, emission factors based on two sets of load conditions (90-105 percent and less than 90 percent) are presented for NO_x and CO. For all other pollutants, load showed some effect on emission levels; however, the trends were not consistent nor were they significant compared to the data scatter. Therefore, the source categories were not further segregated by size or load because no clear effect in emission factors resulting from either of these parameters was observed for all pollutants within the scatter of the data.

In addition, for VOC emissions, the scatter of data did not warrant further categorization based on combustion control techniques previously used for NO_x control, such as PSC and PCC. Therefore, the uncontrolled emission factors for all pollutants, with the exception of NO_x, CO, and PM-10, are for no oxidation control; the data set may include units with control techniques used for NOx control, such as PCC and SCR for lean burn engines, and PSC for rich burn engines. The uncontrolled emission factors for NO_x and CO do not represent any combustion or add-on controls; however, the factors may include turbocharged units. The uncontrolled PM-10 emission factors for 2SLB engines and 4SLB engines also do not represent any combustion or add-on controls.

In summary, the three engine categories identified for stationary natural gas-fired reciprocating engines are 2-stroke lean-burn, 4-stroke lean-burn, and 4-stroke rich-burn. Average uncontrolled emission factors for these three engine categories are presented in Tables 3.4-1 through 3.4-3 at the end of this section. These tables include the average emission factor in units of lb/MMscf and lb/MMBtu, the number of data points used to generate each factor, the relative standard deviation for each emission factor, and the test IDs used for developing this factor. The relative standard deviation is presented to indicate the variability of the data used to calculate each emission factor. The data set used to develop each individual emission factor in these tables can be reviewed in the pollutant specific EF REPORT contained in the data base.

A summary of the reference and the contained information for each source test report in the emissions database is presented in Appendix A. This table presents general information for each test including the database ID, facility name, location, unit tested, engine model, engine size, and pollutants tested. The same information can also be viewed using the emissions database by selecting the VIEW FACILITIES from the MAIN FORM.

VOC Emission Factors

VOC emission factors for these engines were calculated to correspond with EPA's definition of VOC as total organic compounds excluding methane, ethane, and several chlorinated and fluorinated compounds.[1] Since VOCs cannot be measured directly, VOC emission factors must be calculated from other organic measurements. One option for calculating VOC was to subtract methane and ethane emission factors from the TOC emission factor. However, methane emission factors were only available for two of the three engine categories. The other option was to add up the available speciated VOCs in the data base to provide a total VOC emission factor. For this section, VOC was calculated by summing the emission factors of all speciated VOCs. The EPA concluded that this approach was valid since the most prevalent VOC compounds in exhaust from these engines, C_3+ alkanes along with formaldehyde, were included in the summation.

Methane Emission Factors

As previously mentioned, methane emission factors were not available for one of the three engine categories, therefore, methane emission factors needed to be calculated. The approach taken to calculate methane emission factors was to subtract the VOC and ethane emission factors from the TOC emission factor. For consistency, all methane emission factors were calculated in this fashion, even in the two cases where a methane emission factor was measured. To determine if this approach for calculating methane was acceptable, the calculated methane emission factors were compared to the measured methane emission factors in the two cases where methane data was available. For 2 stroke lean-burn engines, the calculated methane emission factors and the measured emission factors compared well, 1.45 lb/MMBtu vs. 1.48 lb/MMBtu, respectively.

- (2-stroke lean-burn) Calculated methane = 1.45 lb/MMBtu
  Measured methane = 1.48 lb/MMBtu

- (4-stroke lean-burn) Calculated methane = 1.25 lb/MMBtu
  Measured methane = 1.31 lb/MMBtu

PM Emission Factors

For a limited number of tests, PM measurements were conducted. For 4SLB engines, these PM measurements include filterable PM-10, inorganic condensable PM, and organic condensable PM. To provide a total PM-10 emission factor, these three PM fractions were added together. For 2SLB and 4SRB engines, only total PM-10 were measured. Although the condensable PM values are not presented as a certain size, EPA has assumed that all condensable PM are ≤ 1 • m in diameter.[1] To provide a total PM-2.5 emission factor, EPA assumed that filterable PM-10 is less than 2.5 • m in diameter. Therefore, the total PM-10 and total PM-2.5 are equal. The EPA believes that this assumption for filterable PM-2.5 is valid since natural gas does not contain ash and the nucleation of PM from combustion products will not yield particles larger than 1 to 2 • m.

CO_2 and SO_2

As outlined in the Procedures for Preparing Emission Factor Documents,[1] emission factors for

CO_2 were calculated by mass balance. This approach was also taken for calculating SO_2. Since the carbon and sulfur content in pipeline-quality natural gas is fairly consistent, EPA believes this is the best method for calculating CO_2 and SO_2 emission factors. For CO_2, it was assumed that 99.5 percent of the fuel carbon was converted to CO_2. For SO_2, a 100 percent conversion of fuel sulfur was assumed. The CO_2 emission factor was based on a carbon weight percent in natural gas of 75 percent and the SO_2 emission factor was based on a sulfur concentration in natural gas of 2,000 grains per million standard cubic feet.

Aldehydes Emission Factors

The EPA has identified that for lean-burn engines, the California Air Resource Board (CARB) 430 measurement method for quantifying aldehyde emissions may have interference problems with the 2, 4-dinitrophenylhydrazine (DNPH) solution. This is due to the expected high concentrations of N_2 and O_2 percent in the engine exhaust stream. In such cases, the reported aldehyde measurements may be biased low. Emission factors based only on FTIR are presented in the AP-42 section for lean burn engines. Separate factors for FTIR and CARB 430 are presented in this document. However, the EPA recommends aldehyde emission factors that are based on FTIR measurements for lean-burn engines. The FTIR is a real-time measurement method approved by the EPA and is capable of monitoring aldehyde emissions.

For rich-burn engines, no interference problems are expected with the CARB 430 method. This is due to the low amount of O_2 percent expected in the engine exhaust stream. Therefore, the aldehyde emission factors for rich-burn engines are based on the average of all gathered emission tests, regardless whether the measurements are based on CARB 430 or FTIR.

Controlled Emission Factors

Controlled emission factors for criteria pollutants are not presented due to the limited number of available emissions data that included corresponding measurements of before and after controls. Controlled emission factors for HAPs are not presented because none of the available control devices are specifically designed for HAP control. The emissions database includes controlled emission factors for criteria pollutants and HAPs; however, it is important to indicate these factors, with exception of the CSU data, do not correspond to and are not based on simultaneous before and after controls measurements. Also note that the CSU data were in draft from as of the publication of this document. Therefore, the controlled emission factors should be used for references purposes only and not as a representation of the control device effectiveness.

Emission reduction levels (in percent reduction) are presented for most types of post-combustion control technologies. These reduction levels are based on the review of the limited available data which provided corresponding measurements of before and after controls. Post-combustion control technologies applicable to these sources include selective catalytic reduction (SCR), non-selective catalytic reduction (NSCR), and catalytic oxidation (CO oxidation catalyst). The approaches used to evaluate the pollution control efficiency of the SCR, NSCR, and the CO oxidation catalyst controls are presented in the following paragraphs. Due to the methods used to evaluate post-combustion control efficiency, the data base does not provide controlled emission levels. In all cases, pollution control efficiency was based on tests conducted upstream and downstream of the control device.

SCR Control

Two sets of upstream and downstream tests on SCR performance were presented in one

reference.[2] These tests were conducted on one 4-stroke lean-burn engine. The average NO_x reduction efficiency across the SCR unit was 77 percent (Table 3.2-1). This reduction efficiency compared well with the results of the SCR analysis conducted by GRI, which reported average NO_x reductions across SCR units for natural gas-fired reciprocating engines of 80 percent.[3]

Table 3.2-1. SCR TEST RESULTS (NO_x)

Data Base I.D.	Uncontrolled Emission Factor (lb/hp-hr)	Controlled Emission Factor (lb/hp-hr)	Percent Reduction (%)
29.41x/29.43x	4.9 E-02	1.2 E-02	76
29.40x/29.42x	4.7 E-02	1.0 E-02	79
		Average	77

NSCR Control

Two sets of upstream and downstream tests on NSCR performance tests were extracted from Reference 2. These tests were conducted on a 4-stroke rich-burn engine. The average NO_x reduction efficiency across the NSCR units is 99 percent, (Table 3.2-2), which represents high level of achievable NO_x reduction. Previously published NO_x reductions achieved with NSCR range from 82 to 99 percent.[4]

The average CO reduction efficiency across the NSCR units is 98 percent. Again, this level of CO reduction is high compared to published CO reductions achieved with NSCR of 90 to 95 percent.

The EPA believes that these levels of emissions reduction may be attributed to fresh or green catalyst conditions. Catalyst performance has been observed to decrease over time due to catalyst decay. Catalyst decaying may result from metals in the exhaust which deposit on the catalysts thus blocking available reaction sites.

Table 3.2-2. NSCR TEST RESULTS (NO_x)

Data Base I.D.	Pollutant	Uncontrolled Emission Factor (lb/hp-hr)	Controlled Emission Factor (lb/hp-hr)	Percent Reduction (%)
29.29x/29.32x	NO_x	1.8 E-02	2.6 E-04	99
29.28x/29.31x	NO_x	1.9 E-02	5.2 E-05	99
			Average	99
29.29x/29.32x	CO	1.2 E-02	1.6 E-04	99
29.28x/29.31x	CO	1.5 E-02	2.6 E-04	98
			Average	98

Catalytic Oxidation Control

Limited emissions data were available for simultaneous measurements of uncontrolled and controlled emissions from engines equipped with oxidation catalysts (CO oxidation catalyst). CO oxidation catalyst performance increases with increased engine exhaust temperatures. For natural gas-fired engines, 2-stroke engines typically have lower exhaust temperatures than 4-stroke engines. Therefore, it is expected that higher CO emission reductions would be achieved from 4-stroke engines as compared to 2-stroke engines. From the gathered emissions data and catalyst manufacturers information, CO catalyst performance for 2SLB natural gas-fired engines is expected to be higher than 80% reduction. As for 4SLB natural gas-fired engines, the CO catalyst performance is expected to be higher than 90% reduction. CO oxidation catalysts can also be used for 4SRB engines; however, current practices favor the use of NSCR (3-way catalyst) for rich burn engines. The gathered emissions data for engines equipped with CO oxidation catalysts are discussed below and presented in Tables 3.2.3 and 3.2.4 for reference purposes.

One 2-stroke lean-burn engine (operating at clean-burn settings) tested under the GRI testing program employed an oxidation catalyst to control CO emissions.[2] Two sets of tests were conducted on this engine. The average CO reduction across the catalytic oxidation catalyst was 92 percent (Table 4.2-3). This level of emission reduction is high when compared to current installations for 2SLB engines.

The EPA testing at CSU also included testing of a CO catalyst on a 2SLB engine equipped with a pre-combustion chamber. The average CO percent reduction achieved during testing was 64 percent. The poor performance of the catalyst system was later contributed to masking/poisoning of the catalyst elements. This was validated by the catalyst manufacturer which provided laboratory analysis to EPA of the catalyst element condition. Only tests with the minimum and the maximum measured performance are presented in Table 3.2.3.

Table 3.2-3. CATALYTIC OXIDATION TEST RESULTS FOR 2SLB ENGINES (CO)[1]

Data Base I.D.	Uncontrolled Emission Factor (lb/hp-hr)	Controlled Emission Factor (lb/hp-hr)	Percent Reduction (%)
29.23/29.27	3.2 E-03	2.3 E-04	93
29.22/29.26	2.8 E-03	2.3 E-04	92
CSU-1.3.1/1.3.2	4.3 E-03	1.8 E-03	58
CSU-1.8.1/1.8.2	2.4 E-03	7.9 E-04	67
		Average	78

[1] Presented tests are for 2SLB engines equipped with a pre-combustion chamber or operating at clean burn conditions. The CSU data is suspect due to poisoning/masking of the catalyst element.

EPA testing at CSU also included testing of a CO oxidation catalyst on a 4SLB engine. Only tests with the minimum and the maximum measured performance are presented in Table 3.2.4. The average CO percent reduction achieved during testing was 95%.

Table 3.2-4. CATALYTIC OXIDATION TEST RESULTS FOR 4SLB ENGINES (CO)

Data Base I.D.	Uncontrolled Emission Factor (lb/hp-hr)	Controlled Emission Factor (lb/hp-hr)	Percent Reduction (%)
CSU-2.5.1/2.5.2	9.43 E-01	6.79 E-02	93
CSU-2.3.1/2.3.2	6.84 E-01	2.61 E-02	96
		Average	95

3.3 Emission Factor Quality Rating System

The quality of the emission factors developed from analysis of the test data was rated utilizing the following general criteria:

A - Excellent: Developed only from A-rated test data taken from many randomly chosen facilities in the industry population. The source category is specific enough so that variability within the source category population may be minimized.

B - Above average: Developed only from A-rated test data from a reasonable number of facilities. Although no specific bias is evident, it is not clear if the facilities tested represent a random sample of the industries. The source category is specific enough so that variability within the source category population may be minimized.

C - Average: Developed only from A- and B-rated test data from a reasonable number of facilities. Although no specific bias is evident, it is not clear if the facilities tested represent a random sample of the industry. In addition, the source category is specific enough so that variability within the source category population may be minimized.

D - Below average: The emission factor was developed only from A- and B-rated test data from a small number of facilities, and there is reason to suspect that these facilities do not represent a random sample of the industry. There also may be evidence of variability within the source category population. Limitations on the use of the emission factor are noted in the emission factor table.

E - Poor: The emission factor was developed from C- and D-rated test data, and there is reason to suspect that the facilities tested do not represent a random sample of the industry. There also may be evidence of variability within the source category population. Limitations on the use of these factors are always noted.

The above criteria for emission factor ratings are defined in an OAQPS document which provided guidance in preparing emission factor documents. The use of these criteria is somewhat subjective and depends to an extent upon the individual reviewer. For this section, as these criteria were applied to the emission factors, the term "number of facilities" was interpreted to mean "number of engines," where multiple tests on a single engine were counted as one test if the tests are based on the same load. This eliminates cases where multiple tests on one engine dominate the data set. Emission factors for this section were rated in the following manner:

A-Rated — Emission factor average based on results of A or B-rated data from fifteen or more different emissions tests.

B-Rated	Emission factor average based on results of A or B-rated data from ten to fourteen different emissions tests.
C-Rated	Emission factor average based on results of A or B-rated data from three to nine different emissions tests.
D-Rated	Emission factor average based on results of A or B-rated data from two or less emissions tests.
E-Rated	Emission factor average based on engineering judgement or from tests rated at C or below.

3.4 Emission Factors

The emission factors for the sources covered in Section 3.2 of the AP-42 document are presented in Tables 3.4-1 through 3.4-3, with each table representing the uncontrolled emission factors for each category. These tables provide the number of tests used in calculating the various emission factors as well as the relative standard deviation associated with each emission factor. This additional information is intended to provide greater insight to the reader about the background of each emission factor. For further detail on each emission factor, the complete data base used to generate these factor is provided on the EPA CHIEF web site (www.epa.gov/ttn/chief). (See Section 3.2.1 for more details on the data base.)

TABLE 3.4-1. UNCONTROLLED EMISSION FACTORS FOR 2-STROKE LEAN-BURN ENGINES

Pollutant	Number of Tests	Emission Factor (lb/MMBtu)	Emission Factor (lb/MMscf)	Relative Standard Deviation (%)	Test IDs
NO_x					
90-105% Load	34	3.17 E+00	3.23 E+03	43.4%	29.1x, 29.2x, 29.7- 29.10x, 29.12x, 29.15x-29.18x, 29.20, 29.21x, 31.3x, 31.6x-31.9x, 31.11x, 31.12x, 31.15x, 31.17x-31.19x, 125.3-125.10, 138, 143.
<90% Load	24	1.94 E+00	1.98 E+03	84.7%	107.7-107.9, 107.11, 107.12, 107.15, 107.16, 107.19, 107.20, 29.3x-29.6x, 29.11x, 29.13x, 29.14x, 29.19x, 31.1x, 31.2x, 31.4x, 31.5x, 31.13x, 31.14x, 31.16x.
CO					
90-105% Load	26	3.86 E-01	3.94 E+02	113.4%	29.1x, 29.2x, 29.7x-29.10x, 29.12x, 29.15x-29.18x, 29.20x, 29.21x, 31.3x, 31.6x-31.9x, 31.11x, 31.12x, 31.15x, 31.17x-31.19x, 138, 143.
<90% Load	24	3.53 E-01	3.60 E+02	55.0%	107.7-107.9, 107.11, 107.12, 107.15, 107.16, 107.19, 107.20, 29.3x-29.6x, 29.11x, 29.13x, 29.14x, 29.19x, 31.1x, 31.2x, 31.4x, 31.5x, 31.13x, 31.14x, 31.16x.
TOC	57	1.64 E+00	1.67 E+03	53.3%	29.2x, 29.5x-29.25x, 31.1x-31.19x, 132, CSU tests: 1.1.1, 1.3.1-1.6.1, 1.8.1-1.16.1, 1.2/7.1.
PM-10 (filterable)	3	3.84 E-02	3.92 E+01	121.4%	31.2x, 31.1x, 31.7x.
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	3	6.63 E-05	6.76 E-02	13.8%	3.1, 3.2, 3.3
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	3	5.27 E-05	5.37 E-02	13.8%	3.1, 3.2, 3.3
1,1-Dichloroethane	3	3.91 E-05	3.99 E-02	13.9%	3.1, 3.2, 3.3
1,2,3-Trimethylbenzene	2	3.54 E-05	3.61 E-02	2.4%	29.7x, 29.10x.
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	4	1.11 E-04	1.13 E-01	70.1%	29.2x, 29.7x, 29.10x, 29.23x.
1,2-Dichloroethane	2	4.22 E-05	4.30 E-02	0.3%	3.1, 3.2, 3.3
1,2-Dichloropropane	3	4.46 E-05	4.55 E-02	13.7%	3.1, 3.2, 3.3
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	1	1.80 E-05	1.84 E-02		29.10x.
1,3-Butadiene	16	8.20 E-04	8.36 E-01	25.2%	29.23x, CSU tests: 1.1.1, 1.3.1-1.6.1, 1.8.1-1.16.1, 1.2/7.1.
1,3-Dichloropropene	3	4.38 E-05	4.47 E-02	13.8%	3.1, 3.2, 3.3

Table 3.4-1. UNCONTROLLED EMISSION FACTORS FOR 2-STROKE LEAN-BURN ENGINES
(Continued)

Pollutant	Number of Tests	Emission Factor (lb/MMBtu)	Emission Factor (lb/MMscf)	Relative Standard Deviation (%)	Test IDs
2,2,4-Trimethylpentane	10	8.46 E-04	8.62 E-01	94.6%	29.2x, 31.19x, 31.16x, 31.12x, 31.11x, 31.8x, 29.7x, 29.10x, 29.23x, 31.3x.
2-Methylnaphthalene	4	2.14 E-05	2.19 E-02	105.6 %	29.5x, 29.7x, 29.9x, 29.23x.
Acenaphthene	4	1.33 E-06	1.36 E-03	108.8%	29.5x, 29.7x, 29.9x, 29.23x.
Acenaphthylene	4	3.17 E-06	3.23 E-03	110.9%	29.5x, 29.7x, 29.9x, 29.23x.
Acetaldehyde					
FTIR	58	7.76 E-03	7.92 E+00	74.6%	29.1x-29.21x, 29.22x-29.25x, 31.1x-31.9x, 31.11x-31.19x, CSU tests: 1.1.1, 1.3.1-1.6.1, 1.8.1-1.16.1, 1.2/7.1.
CARB 430	4	5.22 E-03	5.33 E+00	34.6%	3.1-3.3, 7.13.
Acrolein					
FTIR	48	7.78 E-03	7.94E+00	59.1%	29.1x-29.21x, 29.22x-29.25x, 31.1x-31.8x, CSU tests: 1.1.1, 1.3.1-1.6.1, 1.8.1-1.16.1, 1.2/7.1.
CARB 430	4	2.20 E-03	2.24 E+00		3.1-3.3, 7.13.
Anthracene	4	7.18 E-07	7.32 E-04	124.4%	29.5x, 29.7x, 29.9x, 29.23x.
Benz(a)anthracene	3	3.36 E-07	3.43 E-04	98.6%	29.5x, 29.9x, 29.23x.
Benzene	31	1.94 E-03	1.98 E+00	185.9%	3.1-3.3, 29.2x, 31.19x, 31.16x, 31.12x, 31.11x, 7.14, 31.8x, 29.7x, 29.10x, 29.23x, 11.1, 31.3x, 7.13, CSU tests: 1.1.1, 1.3.1-1.6.1, 1.8.1-1.16.1, 1.2/7.1.
Benzo(a)pyrene	1	5.68 E-09	5.79 E-06		29.23x
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	1	8.51 E-09	8.68 E-06		29.23x
Benzo(e)pyrene	1	2.34 E-08	2.39 E-05		29.23x
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	1	2.48 E-08	2.53 E-05		29.23x
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	1	4.26 E-09	4.35 E-06		29.23x
Biphenyl	3	3.95 E-06	4.03 E-03	53.1%	29.5x, 29.7x, 29.9x.

Table 3.4-1. UNCONTROLLED EMISSION FACTORS FOR 2-STROKE LEAN-BURN ENGINES
(Continued)

Pollutant	Number of Tests	Emission Factor (lb/MMBtu)	Emission Factor (lb/MMscf)	Relative Standard Deviation (%)	Test IDs
Butane	3	4.75 E-03	4.84 E+00	59.5%	29.2x, 29.7x, 29.10x.
Butyr/Isobutyraldehyde	6	4.37 E-04	4.46 E-01	119.8%	29.2x, 29.3x, 29.6x, 29.11x, 29.10x, 29.22x.
Carbon Tetrachloride	3	6.07 E-05	6.19 E-02	13.9%	3.1-3.3
Chlorobenzene	3	4.44 E-05	4.53 E-02	13.8%	3.1-3.3
Chloroform	3	4.71 E-05	4.80 E-02	13.8%	3.1-3.3
Chrysene	3	6.72 E-07	6.84 E-04	98.4%	29.5x, 29.9x, 29.23x.
Cyclohexane	3	3.08 E-04	3.14 E-01	56.4%	29.2x, 29.7x, 29.10x.
Cyclopentane	4	9.47 E-05	9.66 E-02	40.2%	29.2x, 29.7x, 29.10x, 29.23x.
Ethane	23	7.09 E-02	7.23 E+01	39.7%	29.1x-29.23x.
Ethylbenzene	27	1.08 E-04	1.10 E-01	72.9%	29.2x, 29.7x, 29.10x, 3.1-3.3, 11.1, 31.3x, 31.8x, 31.11x, 31.12x, 31.16x, CSU tests: 1.1.1, 1.3.1-1.6.1, 1.8.1-1.16.1, 1.2/7.1.
Ethylene Dibromide	3	7.34 E-05	7.48 E-02	13.9%	3.1-3.3.
Fluoranthene	4	3.61 E-07	3.68 E-04	72.7%	29.5x, 29.7x, 29.9x, 29.23x
Fluorene	3	1.69 E-06	1.72 E-03	154.5%	29.5x, 29.7x, 29.23x.
Formaldehyde					
FTIR	58	5.52 E-02	5.63 E+01	46.3%	29.1x-29.25x, 31.1x-31.9x, 31.11x-31.19x, CSU tests: 1.1.1, 1.3.1-1.6.1, 1.8.1-1.16.1, 1.2/7.1.
CARB 430	8	4.06 E-02	4.14 E+01	73.7%	3.1-3.3, 7.13, 7.14, 11.1, 14.4x, 14.5x.
Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene	1	9.93 E-09	1.01 E-05		29.23x.
Isobutane	3	3.75 E-03	3.82 E+00	54.0%	29.2x, 29.7x, 29.10x.
Methane	36	1.48 E+00	1.51 E+03	38.8%	29.1x-29.21x, CSU tests: 1.1.1, 1.3.1-1.6.1, 1.8.1-1.16.1, 1.2/7.1.
Methanol	43	2.48 E-03	2.53 E+00	47.9%	29.1x-29.25x, 31.1x-31.9x, 31.11x-31.19x.

Table 3.4-1. UNCONTROLLED EMISSION FACTORS FOR 2-STROKE LEAN-BURN ENGINES
(Continued)

Pollutant	Number of Tests	Emission Factor (lb/MMBtu)	Emission Factor (lb/MMscf)	Relative Standard Deviation (%)	Test IDs
Methylcyclohexane	4	3.38 E-04	3.45 E-01	47.6%	29.2x, 29.7x, 29.10x, 29.23x.
Methylene Chloride	3	1.47 E-04	1.50 E-01	70.1%	3.1-3.3.
n-Hexane	9	4.45 E-04	4.54 E-01	62%	29.2x, 29.23x, 31.16x, 31.12x, 31.11x, 31.18x, 29.7x, 29.10x, 31.3x.
n-Nonane	3	3.08 E-05	3.14 E-02	95%	29.7x, 29.10x, 29.23x.
n-Octane	4	7.44 E-05	7.59 E-02	104.6%	29.2x, 29.7x, 29.10x, 29.23x.
n-Pentane	4	1.53 E-03	1.56 E+00	48.8%	29.2x, 29.7x, 29.10x, 29.23x.
Naphthalene	7	9.63 E-05	9.83 E-02	96.8%	29.5x, 7.14, 31.8x, 29.7x, 29.9x, 7.13, 29.23x.
NMHC	44	2.96 E-01	3.02 E+02	99.6%	29.2x, 29.5x-29.10x, 29.12x-29.21x, 107.8, 107.9, 107.11, 107.12, 107.15, 107.16, 107.19, 107.20, 107.23, 107.24, 114.1, 114.2, CSU tests: 1.1.1, 1.3.1-1.6.1, 1.8.1-1.16.1, 1.2/7.1.
PAH	2	1.34 E-04	1.37 E-01	66.3%	31.8x, 7.13.
Perylene	1	4.97 E-09	5.07 E-06		29.23x.
Phenanthrene	4	3.53 E-06	3.60 E-03	116.7%	29.5x, 29.7x, 29.9x, 29.23x.
Phenol	3	4.21 E-05	4.30 E-02	64.0%	29.5x, 29.7x, 29.9x.
Propane	4	2.87 E-02	2.93 E+01	42.2%	29.2x, 29.7x, 29.10x, 29.23x.
Pyrene	4	5.84 E-07	5.96 E-04	92.9%	29.5x, 29.7x, 29.9x, 29.23x.
Styrene	21	5.48 E-05	5.59 E-02	21%	3.1-3.3, 29.2x, 29.7x, 29.10x, CSU tests: 1.1.1, 1.3.1-1.6.1, 1.8.1-1.16.1, 1.2/7.1.
Toluene	31	9.63 E-04	9.82 E-01	86.5%	3.1-3.3, 29.2x, 29.7x, 29.10x, 29.23x, 31.3x, 31.11x, 31.12x, 31.8x, 31.16x, 31.19x, 11.1, 7.14, 7.13, CSU tests: 1.1.1, 1.3.1-1.6.1, 1.8.1-1.16.1, 1.2/7.1.
Vinyl Chloride	3	2.47 E-05	2.52 E-02	13.9%	3.1-3.3.
Xylene	15	2.68 E-04	2.73 E-01	153.7%	3.1-3.3, 29.2x, 29.7x, 29.10x, 29.23x, 31.3x, 31.11x, 31.12x, 31.8x, 31.16x, 11.1, 7.14, 7.13.

Table 3.4-2. UNCONTROLLED EMISSION FACTORS FOR 4-STROKE LEAN BURN ENGINES

Pollutant	Number of Tests	Emission Factor (lb/MMBtu)	Emission Factor (lb/MMscf)	Relative Standard Deviation (%)	Test IDs
NO_x					
90-105% Load	25	4.08 E+00	4.16E+03	106.8%	118, 29.33x, 29.34x, 29.37x, 29.38x, 29.40x, 29.41x, 125.11-125.15, CSU tests: 2.1.1, 2.4.1-2.6.1, 2.8.1-2.16.1.
<90% Load	13	8.47 E-01	8.64 E+02	206.9%	29.35x, 29.36x, 29.39x, 144.1-144.6, 147, CSU tests: 2.2.1, 2.3.1, 2.7.1.
CO					
90-105% Load	20	3.17 E-01	3.23 E+02	44.8%	118, 29.33x, 29.34x, 29.37x, 29.38x, 29.40x, 29.41x, CSU tests: 2.1.1, 2.4.1-2.6.1, 2.8.1-2.16.1.
<90% Load	13	5.57 E-01	5.68 E+02	35.0%	29.35x, 29.36x, 29.39x, 144.1-144.6, 147, CSU tests: 2.2.1, 2.3.1, 2.7.1.
TOC	37	1.47 E+00	1.50 E+03	27.2%	29.33x-29.41x, CSU tests: 2.1.1-2.16.1.
PM-10 (filterable)	2	7.71 E-05	7.86 E-02	60.3%	29.34x, 29.38x.
Inorganic Condensable PM	2	5.50 E-03	5.62 E+00	28.9%	29.34x, 29.38x.
Organic Condensable PM	2	4.41 E-03	4.50 E+00	71.2%	29.34x, 29.38x.
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	9	<4.00 E-05	<4.08 E-02	13.1%	3.7-3.15.
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	9	<3.18 E-05	<3.24 E-02	13.1%	3.7-3.15.
1,1-Dichloroethane	9	<2.36 E-05	<2.40 E-02	13.1%	3.7-3.15.
1,2,3-Trimethylbenzene	1	2.30 E-05	2.35 E-02		29.42x.
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	3	1.43 E-05	1.46 E-02	21.2%	29.39x, 29.42x, 29.45x.
1,2-Dichloroethane	9	<2.36 E-05	<2.40 E-02	13.1%	3.7-3.15.
1,2-Dichloropropane	9	<2.69 E-05	<2.74 E-02	13.1%	3.7-3.15.
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	2	3.38 E-05	3.44 E-02	6.1%	29.39x, 29.42x.
1,3-Butadiene	1	2.67 E-04	2.72 E-01		25.2
1,3-Dichloropropene	9	<2.64 E-05	<2.70 E-02	13.2%	3.7-3.15.
2-Methylnaphthalene	3	3.32 E-05	3.39 E-02	170.5%	29.42x, 29.44x, 29.45x.

Table 3.4-2. UNCONTROLLED EMISSION FACTORS FOR 4-STROKE LEAN BURN ENGINES
(Continued)

Pollutant	Number of Tests	Emission Factor (lb/MMBtu)	Emission Factor (lb/MMscf)	Relative Standard Deviation (%)	Test IDs
2,2,4-Trimethylpentane	3	2.50 E-04	2.55 E-01	48.9%	29.39x, 29.42x, 29.45x.
Acenapthene	3	1.25 E-06	1.27 E-03	170.3%	29.42x, 29.44x, 29.45x.
Acenaphthylene	3	5.53 E-06	5.64 E-03	170.4%	29.42x, 29.44x, 29.45.
Acetaldehyde					
FTIR	31	8.36 E-03	8.53 E+00	72.9%	29.33x-29.38x, 29.41x, 29.44x-29.51x, CSU tests: 2.1.1-2.16.1.
CARB 430	1	8.56 E-04	8.73 E-01		25.2.
Acrolein					
FTIR	32	5.14 E-03	5.24 E+00	58.7%	29.33x-29.38x, 29.41x, 29.44x-29.52x, CSU tests: 2.1.1-2.16.1.
CARB 430	3	9.10 E-04	9.28 E-01	81.4%	3.7, 3.1, 25.2.
Benzene	16	4.40 E-04	4.49 E-01	80.3%	29.33x, 29.37x, 29.39x, 3.7-3.15, 4, 25.2, 29.42x, 29.45x.
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	2	1.66 E-07	1.70 E-04	138.3%	29.44x, 29.45x.
Benzo(e)pyrene	2	4.15 E-07	4.23 E-04	138.5%	29.44x, 29.45x.
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	2	4.14 E-07	4.23 E-04	138.8%	29.44x, 29.45x.
Biphenyl	2	2.12 E-04	2.16 E-01	22.7%	29.33x, 29.37x.
Butane	2	5.41 E-04	5.52 E-01	17.9%	29.33x, 29.37x.
Butyr/Isobutyraldehyde	3	1.01 E-04	1.03 E-01	94.2%	29.39x, 29.44x, 29.45x.
Carbon Tetrachloride	9	<3.67 E-05	<3.74 E-02	13.1%	3.7-3.15.
Chlorobenzene	10	<3.04 E-05	<3.11 E-02	39.5%	3.7-3.15.
Chloroethane	1	1.87 E-06	1.91 E-03		4
Chloroform	9	<2.85 E-05	<2.90 E-02	13.1%	3.7-3.15.
Chrysene	3	6.93 E-07	7.06 E-04	169.8%	29.42x, 29.44x, 29.45x.

Table 3.4-2. UNCONTROLLED EMISSION FACTORS FOR 4-STROKE LEAN-BURN ENGINES
(Continued)

Pollutant	Number of Tests	Emission Factor (lb/MMBtu)	Emission Factor (lb/MMscf)	Relative Standard Deviation (%)	Test IDs
Cyclopentane	3	2.27 E-04	2.31 E-01	47.7%	29.39x, 29.44x, 29.45x.
Ethane	6	1.05 E-01	1.08 E+02	102.6%	29.34x, 29.33x, 29.37x, 29.38, 29.44x, 29.45x.
Ethylbenzene	14	3.97 E-05	4.05 E-02	52.7 %	29.39x, 3.7-3.15, 4, 25.2, 29.42x, 29.45x
Ethylene Dibromide	9	<4.43 E-05	<4.52 E-02	13.2%	3.7-3.15.
Fluoranthene	3	1.11 E-06	1.13 E-03	170.1%	29.42x, 29.44x, 29.45x.
Fluorene	5	5.67 E-06	5.78 E-03	102.9%	29.33x, 29.37x, 29.42x, 29.44x, 29.45x..
Formaldehyde					
FTIR	32	5.28 E-02	5.39 E+01	31.7%	29.33x-29.38x, 29.41x-29.52x, CSU tests: 2.1.1-2.16.1.
CARB 430	5	1.38 E-02	1.41 E+01	63.7%	3.12, 21, 3.7, 3.11, 25.2.
Methane	20	1.31 E+00	1.34 E+03	26.7%	29.33x, 29.34x, 29.37x, 29.38x, CSU tests: 2.1.1-2.16.1.
Methanol	15	2.50 E-03	2.55 E+00	47.5%	29.34x-29.38x, 29.41x, 29.44x-29.52x.
Methylcyclohexane	3	1.23 E-03	1.25 E+00	60.0%	29.39x, 29.42x, 29.45x.
Methylene Chloride	9	2.00 E-05	2.04 E-02	23.6%	3.7-3.15.
n-Hexane	5	1.11 E-03	1.13 E-00	111.0%	29.33x, 29.37x, 29.39x, 29.42x, 29.45x.
n-Nonane	3	1.10 E-04	1.13 E-01	52.7%	29.39x, 29.42x, 29.45x.
n-Octane	3	3.51 E-04	3.58 E-01	59.5%	29.39x, 29.42x, 29.45x.
n-Pentane	5	2.60 E-03	2.65 E+00	109.5%	29.33x, 29.37x, 29.39x, 29.42x, 29.45x.
Naphthalene	6	7.44 E-05	7.59 E-02	213.2%	29.37x, 29.33x, 29.44x, 29.45x, 25.2, 4.
NMHC	18	1.06 E-01	1.08 E-02	16.1%	116.1, 116.2, CSU tests: 2.1.1-2.16.1.
PAH	1	2.69 E-05	2.74 E-02		25.2.
Phenanthrene	2	1.04 E-05	1.06 E-02	138.3%	29.44x, 29.45x.
Phenol	2	2.40 E-05	2.45 E-02	80.9%	29.33x, 29.37x.

Table 3.4-2. UNCONTROLLED EMISSION FACTORS FOR 4-STROKE LEAN-BURN ENGINES
(Continued)

Pollutant	Number of Tests	Emission Factor (lb/MMBtu)	Emission Factor (lb/MMscf)	Relative Standard Deviation (%)	Test IDs
Propane	5	4.19 E-02	4.28 E+01	104.2%	29.33x, 29.37x, 29.39x, 29.42x, 29.45x.
Pyrene	3	1.36 E-06	1.41 E-03	170.2%	29.42x, 29.44x, 29.45x.
Styrene	26	<2.36 E-05	<2.41 E-02	133.0%	29.33x, 3.7-3.15, CSU tests: 2.1.1-2.16.1.
Tetrachloroethane	1	2.48 E-06	2.53 E-03		4
Toluene	14	4.08 E-04	4.16 E-01	79.9%	3.7-3.15, 29.39x, 29.42x, 29.45x, 25.2, 4.
Vinyl Chloride	9	1.49 E-05	1.52 E-02	13.2%	3.7-3.15.
Xylene	14	1.84 E-04	1.88 E-01	94.5%	29.39x, 3.7-3.15, 29.42x, 29.45x, 25.2, 4.

Table 3.4-3. UNCONTROLLED EMISSION FACTORS FOR 4-STROKE RICH-BURN ENGINES

Pollutant	Number of Tests	Emission Factor (lb/MMBtu)	Emission Factor (lb/MMscf)	Relative Standard Deviation (%)	Test IDs
NO_x					
90-105% Load	21	2.21 E+00	2.26 E+03	23.7%	108.5.1-108.7.1, 151.1, 151.3, 151.5, 151.7, 151.9, 151.11, 151.13, 151.15, 151.17, 151.19, 151.21, 151.23, 151.25, 151.27, 160.1.1-160.4.1.
<90% Load	7	2.27 E+00	2.31 E+03	19.7%	120, 108.1.1-108.4.1, 29.28x, 29.29x.
CO					
90-105% Load	18	3.72 E+00	3.79 E+03	34.3%	151.1, 151.3, 151.5, 151.7, 151.9, 151.11, 151.13, 151.15, 151.17, 151.19, 151.21, 151.23, 151.25, 151.27, 160.1.1-160.4.1.
<90% Load	3	3.51 E+00	3.58 E+03	74.3%	120, 29.28x, 29.29x.
TOC	7	3.58 E-01	3.65 E+02	79.7%	129.1-129.4, 141, 29.28x, 29.29x.
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	3	2.53 E-05	2.58 E-02	40.9%	3.16, 3.18, 3.20.
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	3	<1.53 E-05	<1.56 E-02	0.4%	3.16, 3.18, 3.20.
1,1-Dichloroethane	3	<1.13 E-05	<1.16 E-02	0.5%	3.16, 3.18, 3.20.
1,2-Dichloroethane	3	<1.13 E-05	<1.16 E-02	0.5%	3.16, 3.18, 3.20.
1,2-Dichloropropane	3	<1.30 E-05	<1.33 E-02	0.0%	3.16, 3.18, 3.20.
1,3-Butadiene	2	6.63 E-04	6.76 E-01	74.2%	25.3, 25.4
1,3-Dichloropropene	3	<1.27 E-05	<1.30 E-02	0.5%	3.16, 3.18, 3.20.
Acetaldehyde	9	2.79 E-03	2.84 E+00	84.5%	7.5-7.8, 7.12, 29.29x, 29.28x, 25.3, 25.4.
Acrolein	9	2.63 E-03	2.69 E+00	125.0%	7.5-7.8, 7.12, 29.29x, 29.28x, 25.3, 25.4.
Benzene	18	1.58 E-03	1.61 E+00	152%	7.1-7.8, 7.10-12, 11.2, 11.3, 3.16, 3.18, 3.20, 25.3, 25.4.
Butyr/isobutyraldehyde	1	4.86 E-05	4.96 E-02		29.28x.
Carbon Tetrachloride	3	<1.77 E-05	<1.81 E-02	0.0%	3.16, 3.18, 3.20.
Chlorobenzene	3	<1.29 E-05	<1.32 E-02	0.4%	3.16, 3.18, 3.20.
Chloroform	3	<1.37 E-05	<1.40 E-02	0.4%	3.16, 3.18, 3.20.

Table 3.4-3. UNCONTROLLED EMISSION FACTORS FOR 4-STROKE RICH-BURN ENGINES
(Continued)

Pollutant	Number of Tests	Emission Factor (lb/MMBtu)	Emission Factor (lb/MMscf)	Relative Standard Deviation (%)	Test IDs
Ethylbenzene	7	<2.48 E-05	<2.53 E-02	48.9%	11.2, 11.3, 3.16, 3.18, 3.20, 25.3, 25.4.
Ethylene Dibromide	3	<2.13 E-05	<2.18 E-02	0.3%	3.16, 3.18, 3.20.
Formaldehyde	18	2.05 E-02	2.09 E+01	87.5%	7.1-7.8, 7.10-7.12, 3.16, 11.2, 11.3, 29.29x, 29.28x, 25.3, 25.4.
Methanol	2	3.06 E-03	3.12 E+00	0.2%	29.29x, 29.28x.
Methylene Chloride	3	4.12 E-05	4.21 E-02	65.7%	3.16, 3.18, 3.20.
Naphthalene	13	<9.71 E-05	<9.90 E-02	131.1%	7.1-7.8, 7.10-7.12, 25.3, 25.4.
NMHC	12	1.00 E-01	1.02 E+02	93.6%	112.11, 112.15-112.18, 112.20, 120, 157.1, 157.2, 133, 102.1, 102.2..
PAH	2	1.41 E-04	1.43 E-01	121.1%	25.3, 25.4.
Styrene	3	<1.19 E-05	<1.22 E-02	0.5%	3.16, 3.18, 3.20.
Toluene	18	5.58 E-04	5.70 E-01	131.1%	7.1-7.8, 7.10-7.12, 11.2, 11.3, 3.16, 3.18, 3.20, 25.3, 25.4.
Vinyl Chloride	3	<7.18 E-06	<7.32 E-03	0.2%	3.16, 3.18, 3.20.
Xylene	18	1.95 E-04	1.99 E-01	102.3%	7.1-7.8, 7.10-7.12, 11.2, 11.3, 3.16, 3.18, 3.20, 25.3, 25.4.

3.5 REFERENCES FOR SECTION 3

1. *Procedures for Preparing Emission Factor Documents*, Third Revised Draft Version, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, U.S. EPA, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711, November 1996.

2. Shareef, G.S., K.R. Ferry, M. Gunduppa, C.A. Leatherwood, L.D. Ogle, L.M. Campbell, *Measurement of Air Toxic Emissions from Natural Gas-Fired Internal Combustion Engines at Natural Gas Transmission and Storage Facilities*, prepared by Radian Corporation for the Gas Research Institute, GRI-96/0009, February 1996.

3. Shareef, G.S., and D.K. Stone, Evaluation of SCR NO_x Controls for Small Natural Gas-Fueled Prime Movers, prepared by Radian Corporation, for the Gas Research Institute, GRI-90/0138, July 1990.

4. Alternative Control Techniques Document - NO_x Emissions From Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines, EPA-453/R-93-032, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, NC, July 1993.

4.0 Revised AP-42 Section 3.2

THIS PAGE BLANK (USPTO)